THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

THE 'Annual Lecture' occupies a place of its own in theological literature. Founded usually in pious memory of some noble personality, the Lecture provides a means whereby the particular field of study that was associated with his name may be enriched by the contributions of up-to-date scholarship. It also provides a means of recognizing the merit of the scholarship that the person appointed has hitherto displayed in this particular field or in one closely related to it. Unfortunately, however, there is no guarantee that the 'Annual Lecture,' when delivered, will show any particular merit in itself. It may merely recapitulate some theory or point of view with which the lecturer's name is already associated, and, occasionally, it would appear, the lecturer has not over-burdened himself with anxiety in his effort to satisfy the Lectureship's requirements.

This is one way of saying that when one begins to read an 'Annual Lecture' it is with a certain wariness. We have heard it all before, and, anyhow, what lecturer, even if his lips have been touched by live coal from off the altar, will be able to say anything provocatively original in an hour? Are not our shelves stuffed with volumes of Giffords, Bamptons, *et hoc genus omne*, whose creation bears witness to the fact that it is not intellectually respectable to present a message to the world that is not a good many times longer than the New Testament, and far more difficult to understand?

It would be a pity, however, if readers were to ignore *The Human Situation*,[1] by Principal John BAILLIE, D.D., D.Litt., LL.D. Not that any who are familiar with the works of the brothers Baillie would be likely to ignore anything produced by either of them. In this William Ainslie Memorial Lecture Dr. BAILLIE draws upon those resources of his which appear to be inexhaustible, and presents a fresh and challenging survey of the problems of our time. There are only twenty-eight pages of this Lecture, but the argument is close, the reasoning has a punch in it, and the conclusion is a powerful Christian plea.

[1] Longmans; 2s. 6d. net.

Dr. BAILLIE begins by remarking that now all romantic illusions have gone. To-day we view the ultimate issue 'without blinkers.' He quotes Neville Talbot approvingly: 'When the bottom questions stir, the hunt is up for the Gospel.' He protests, however, against the way in which the 'ultimate human predicament' is presented. Modern knowledge enables man 'to realise all the more clearly the hopelessness of evading final disaster and total extinction. It is suggested to me that that is, in a nutshell, the whole truth of the situation in which the human race stands.' He points out, however, that the more extreme utterances of our time are not likely to shock one who has in his mind such older words as 'all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass,' and many other sayings of the kind. To the older words were added of course: 'But the word of the Lord endureth for ever.' This, he declares, was no after-thought, but the foundation of the whole. It is wrong to suggest that the human race awakes to consciousness on this planet and finds itself confronted only by an environing system of Nature that has no relation to its own interests. 'Not thus did the race come to its first awareness, and not thus has any human individual come to his.' He quotes the late Wheeler Robinson seeking for the Hebrew word for 'Nature.' He quoted the definition given in the Oxford Dictionary, and then wrote, 'The only way to render this idea into Hebrew would be to say simply "God."'

This means that it is wrong to represent mankind's spiritual outlook as something foisted on a more primitive 'state of Nature.' 'It would be an entirely superficial exercise on my part, were I to begin my proof of what I believe from a prior position of unbelief, trying to find room for God within a situation, or by the enlargement of a situation, in which He did not yet exist. It is on the denial, not on the affirmation, that the burden of proof reposes, both for our race, as a whole, and for any individual in it.'

Then he turns to consider what the scientific naturalists are likely to say when they attempt this burden of proof, and shows that they usually proceed by way of abstraction. Whitehead's

remark is recalled that a man may know all about the laws of light, and yet, perhaps, just because he has learned so much about them, miss the radiance of the sunset and the glory of the morning sky. Dr. BAILLIE's knowledge of Greek Philosophy is strongly in evidence in this part of his Lecture, and he shows that the naturalist view can only succeed by applying this principle of abstraction no less to our social experience than to our knowledge of the external world. He deals convincingly and cogently with the mind-matter problem, and then, trenchantly also, with the oft-repeated position of the scientific naturalists that, though Nature is at worst indifferent to my designs, I must not use or exploit my fellow-men. Why? Dr. BAILLIE asks. The Christian answer is that it is an obligation laid on me by God. Is there any other? Here, having dealt previously with Sartre, he comes to grips with Dr. Alex. Comfort whose thesis is that my sense of responsibility toward my neighbour is derivative from my desire *that the human race should survive as long as possible*. Having enjoyed himself to the full over that, Dr. BAILLIE proceeds to sum up by declaring that the true human situation in which we stand is constituted by the fact that a claim is being made on me to which I must give precedence over all considerations of my own survival or the survival of the whole human race.

The test case for naturalism is whether or not you can naturalize Christ. 'If ever I want to persuade myself that, as part of Nature, I am free to follow my desire, then I had better keep the Gospels, and the whole Bible, well out of sight.'

The dogma on the bodily Assumption of Our Lady recently promulgated by the Pope is of such significance in the ecclesiastical world that further reference to it in these columns can hardly be regarded as amiss.

Even before the dogma was declared the declaration of it was deprecated by writers of the Roman Catholic persuasion. Thus Victor BENNETT and Raymond WINCH in a book on *The Assumption of Our Lady and Catholic Theology* are bold and frank enough to say: 'Viewed in all its bearings, a dogmatic definition of the Assumption by the Pope must seem a most unhappy development of the present religious situation. As well as being defective in all the relevant fields of evidence, the Assumption, if raised to a dogma, would have, as indicated, unhappy repercussions on the prestige of the Papacy, on the general trend of Roman Catholic devotion and on what is a burning question for the twentieth century, the reunion of Christendom.'[1]

The proposed declaration of the dogma was also deprecated from outside the Roman Catholic persuasion by the two highest dignitaries of the Anglican Communion. Thus in his Presidential Address on *Authority in Doctrine*,[2] given by the Archbishop of York to the York Convocation on 12th October 1950, the following statement appears: 'The Pope's intention to proclaim a new dogma is much to be regretted; his recent Encyclical and various utterances by Roman Catholics have forced into controversy many who would have greatly preferred at this time to have remained silent. We admire the devotion of millions of members of the Roman Catholic Church, its greatness as a school for saints, its steadfastness in defence of a supernatural faith, and the loyalty of so many of its clergy and laity under Communist persecution. But the proposed dogma will add yet another obstacle to Christian unity.'

Of course it is not only the enunciation of a new dogma that the Archbishop regrets from the Anglican standpoint; it is also the enunciation of a dogma which is without authority in Scripture and the Creeds. He recognizes that for many centuries there has been widespread belief in the ancient Churches of Christendom in the assumption of the body of the Blessed Virgin into heaven, but has at the same time to point out that the bodily Assumption (whether during the lifetime or after the death of the Blessed Virgin) was never taught as a necessary dogma of faith. Many indeed rejected it, and until the present day there have been Roman Catholics who openly argued against it on historical and doctrinal grounds.

It is worth noticing that the only doctrinal support which the Roman Catholics bring forward for it is, as the Archbishop says, a 'doubtful logical deduction' from the dogma (promulgated in 1854) of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin (itself a dogma which might be described in the Archbishop's phrase as a 'doubtful logical deduction' from the dogma of Original Sin).

Since the new dogma of the Assumption has been proclaimed, a memorandum has been issued by a group of theologians in Heidelberg, under the leadership of Professor Edmund Schlink, in which 'Evangelical Theology delivers its soul

[1] P. 13 f; cf. *Scottish Journal of Theology*, iv. [March, 1951] 96.

[2] S.P.C.K.; 1s.

and in the most brotherly spirit warns the Roman Church of the dire consequences of its action, not only for the Ecumenical Church but even for the Church of Rome itself. The document is a model of theological discussion and a notable contribution to the relation between the Roman Catholic and Evangelical Churches.'

The above is a quotation from a review of the aforesaid memorandum that has appeared under the name of Professor T. F. Torrance,[1] who singles out from the memorandum and discusses what appear to be the questions of outstanding significance raised by the proclamation of the new dogma.

Like the Heidelberg theologians whose work he reviews this able and zealous young theologian of the Church of Scotland sounds clearly and without equivocation the Scriptural principle of the Evangelical Churches. With them he is astounded that the Roman Church would proclaim a dogma based on another foundation than that of the Prophets and Apostles. With them he must point out the confusion this dogma brings into the Apostolic faith, which waits for the coming of the Lord and the redemption of the body. ('The next dogmatic step of importance which the Roman Church, to be consistent, must take, will be to deny the Second Advent of Christ and teach in deadly earnest a fully realized eschatology.') With them also he regards it as ominous that as the Virgin Mary is the symbol for the celibate priesthood, which gives birth to the Eucharistic Christ, her bodily assumption into heaven carries with it what amounts to the deification of the priesthood itself. ('This crowns the age-long Roman teaching that through the divine grace the priest is *divus*.')

A Reformed Churchman of the liberal as distinguished from the conservative type might not be perturbed by the last two considerations, but he probably would be by the first consideration, as much as any Evangelical or Anglican. In any case he would be at one with them in regretting the accentuation of the divisions of Christendom which the formulation of this new dogma by the Roman Catholic Church must inevitably bring about.

[1] *Scottish Journal of Theology*, iv. [March, 1951] 91.

The Mind of Christ

IV. Christ's Attitude to Institutions

By Professor George B. Caird, D.Phil., McGill University, Montreal

Few modern Christians would wish to deny that slavery is incompatible with the ethical principles enunciated in the teaching of Jesus. Yet there is no saying recorded in the Gospels in which Jesus attacked the system of slave labour which was universal throughout the ancient world, nor is it likely that any such saying ever passed His lips, at least in a public utterance. Neither Jesus nor His early followers were in a position to introduce social and political reforms into the vast structure of the Roman Empire. Moreover, Jesus was concerned not with the old order of the world but with the new order of the Kingdom which He had come to initiate. His ethical teaching was designed for those who entered the Kingdom. And within the Kingdom, as the experience of the Early Church was to show, slavery, without being officially abolished, could be ignored. Jesus concentrated on setting right the relations between man and God and between man and man, and He left the wider social relationships to take care of themselves. It would be wrong to say that the teaching of Jesus was individual and not social, for the commandment of love could hardly be practised in isolation. The simplest command of Jesus carried with it immense social implications. But the society which Jesus seems to have had in mind was one dominated by the natural ties of marriage, family, and neighbourhood rather than by social institutions.

It is, however, possible, by piecing together scattered fragments of evidence, to learn something of Jesus' attitude to the two most important institutions of His day—the Temple and the State.

The Temple

(1) Jesus predicted the destruction of Herod's temple. 'Seest thou these great buildings? there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down' (Mk 13^2). This event was presumably linked in the mind of Jesus with the fall of Jerusalem to an invading army, which He also foretold (Lk 19^{43} 21^{20}). And this wiping out of the holy city together with its sanctuary was to be the outcome of the Jewish rejection of Jesus.

At the time of the Babylonian exile Ezekiel saw in a vision the glory of the Lord—the symbol of

the Divine presence—leaving the Temple in order that Jerusalem, abandoned by God to her fate, might receive punishment at the hands of her enemies; and the vision had had an unforgettable fulfilment. Jesus foresaw a similar fate for the Jerusalem of His own day. 'Behold, your house is left to you desolate' (Lk 13^{35}). Whether by 'your house' Jesus meant the city or the Temple, the reference is the same. In rejecting Jesus, the Jews had rejected the demands and the resources of the Kingdom of God, the protective Divine presence was now finally withdrawn, and nothing remained for them but the inevitable desolation.

(2) Part of the reason for the forthcoming destruction of the Temple, then, was that the Temple authorities and the people whom they represented had rejected Jesus. But beneath this rejection there lay other cogent reasons, and the words uttered by Jesus at the cleansing of the Temple indicate two of them. 'Is it not written My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer? but ye have made it a den of thieves' (Mk 11^{17}). The Jews had interpreted their election to be God's special people as a privilege instead of a responsibility. They had neglected their missionary task, and so had forfeited their calling. Instead of being the centre of a world religion, the Temple had become the symbol of nationalism and division. It was the court of the Gentiles that was being desecrated by the traffic of Jews who looked down with contempt on the 'sinners of the Gentiles.' But besides this the Temple authorities, whose sole reason for existence was to bring men into vital contact with the presence of God, were wilfully frustrating that purpose by allowing the profiteers to grow rich at the expense of the pilgrims.

The Temple was doomed because it was not fulfilling the purposes for which it was ordained. And this was true also of the Temple sacrifices. With one voice the prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries had condemned sacrifices because they did not represent the honest, spontaneous, self-dedication of the people. In a quotation from Hosea, Jesus reiterated this prophetic criticism, and applied it to all merely external observances which do not flow from the sincere devotion of the heart. 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice' (Mt 9^{13} 12^{7}).

(3) The destruction of the Temple did not mean for Jesus the loss of all that the Temple and its worship had stood for in the religion of Israel. The Temple and its sacrifices had provided the Old Testament answer to two questions which penetrate to the roots of religious faith: 'Where can I find God?' and 'Wherewith shall I come before the Lord?' To each of these questions Jesus was to provide a more adequate answer. The Temple was to yield place to something new. 'Something greater than the Temple is here' (Mt 12^{6}).

The false witnesses suborned for the trial of Jesus before Caiaphas declared that Jesus had said: 'I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands' (Mk 14^{58}). This charge has repercussions in the taunts of the bystanders at the Cross (Mk 15^{29}), and in the similar charge brought forward in the prosecution of Stephen (Ac 6^{14}). John gives a different version of the saying: 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up,' and adds the comment that Jesus was speaking of His body (Jn 2^{19}). We should be strongly inclined to accept the word of the Fourth Evangelist against that of the false witnesses who, in spite of every inducement, were unable to agree among themselves, were it not for his remarkable partiality for double entendres. Here as elsewhere we have to allow for the possibility that his eagerness to find a hidden meaning has influenced the form in which he has recorded the saying of Jesus, and so we cannot with any certainty recover the exact wording of Jesus' claim. But in view of John's evidence we can assume that the charge brought against Jesus was not wholly without foundation. Even on such conflicting testimony as we have, it can reasonably be asserted that Jesus claimed to be Himself taking the place of the old institution of worship whose doom He had prophesied.

(4) This conclusion is born out by Jesus' use of sacrificial terminology to describe His own death. One reason why the Temple was due to disappear was that its sacrifices had not provided for the worshipper the atonement and the access to God without which all worship is but an outward show. Jesus was not satisfied with repeating the attack which the prophets had made on religious formalism. He undertook to succeed where the old dispensation had failed. 'The Son of man came not to be served but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many' (Mk 10^{45}). The old covenant, sealed with the blood of sacrifice at Sinai, had failed, as Jeremiah saw when he prophesied the establishment of a new covenant founded on the forgiveness of sins. To this prophecy Jesus made reference in the Upper Room. Mark and Paul record His saying in different ways, so that here again we are in doubt about the exact wording. But the two versions are in substantial agreement, and their combined testimony is too strong to be set aside. 'This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many' (Mk 14^{24}). 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood' (1 Co 11^{25}).

In the New Testament writings the Temple is allowed a certain limited justification in God's

plan of redemption. While it stood it reminded men of their spiritual needs, even if their sins prevented these needs from being satisfied. It held 'a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things' (He 10^{1}), and it pointed forward with a mute testimony to one in whom the Word was to become flesh and tabernacle among men. But when the reality came, the shadow had outlived its usefulness, and it must give place to the living temple of Christ and those who were built up with Him into the living edifice of His Church.

There is enough evidence in the teaching of Jesus preserved in the Synoptic Gospels to suggest that this attitude of the Early Church was founded on the attitude of Jesus, who saw Himself as the fulfilment of all that was valuable in the traditions of God's people.

The State

What Jesus thought about the State has to be pieced together from equally slender evidence, but with two added complications. He lived under three different governments: the Roman Empire, the kingdom of Herod Antipas, and the local government of the Jews. In the third of these institutions no distinction was made between Church and State, for the legal code of Judaism was both civil and religious.

There is also one further limitation imposed inevitably by the conditions in which Jesus lived and taught. For the first three centuries Christianity was a minority movement, unable to influence the policies of State. We look in vain, therefore, in the teaching of the New Testament for any suggestion that the State might be the instrument of expressing the Christian's loving concern for his neighbour's welfare. But the silence of the New Testament writers on this point is clearly due to circumstance and not necessarily to principle. By the standards of the Early Church, therefore, the State could be justified only as the authority which maintains, by coercion if need be, the social framework of order and justice. This is the point of view expressed by Paul in Ro 13, where the State is said to have been ordained by God for the suppression and discouragement of evil-doers. It remains to be seen, then, whether we have any evidence to show that Jesus accorded to the State this qualified justification.

(1) For the furtherance of His own mission Jesus rejected the use of political means. He repudiated the popular conception of Messiahship, avoided the crowd that wanted to make Him King, warned Jerusalem that her aspirations after political independence were leading her to disaster, and chose for Himself the path of suffering and death.

(2) Similarly, for His disciples who were in the Kingdom, Jesus forbad any resort to the coercive methods of worldly politics. 'You know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister: And whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all' (Mk 10^{42-44}). The disciples are not even to avail themselves of the justice and protection afforded by the courts of law (Mt 5^{38-40}).

(3) On a number of occasions Jesus criticised severely the abuse of power by the various governments under which He lived. He predicted His own unjust condemnation by Jewish and Gentile courts and warned His disciples of a similar fate. And besides these explicit criticisms, there are the many pictures in the parables of cruel rulers, unjust judges, and bellicose kings, which were probably drawn from real life.

(4) Nevertheless, Jesus realized that His followers must live not only in the Kingdom, but in the world. His ethical teaching does not belong to any ideal world or perfect society in which there would be no wrongs to forgive. He tells His disciples, accordingly, to submit to legal authority. They are to take the sting from the compulsion of the hated press-gang not by resistance or recalcitrance but by going twice the required distance (Mt 5^{41}). They are to pay to Cæsar whatever is Cæsar's due (Mk 12^{17}).

(5) The attitude of Christ to the State may be further elucidated by a study of His attitude to law. It is true that law for a Jew was an ambiguous term, partly civil and partly religious in content. But many of the laws discussed in the teaching of Jesus, whatever their religious foundation, are undeniably State laws which must find their place in any civil code: for example, the *lex talionis*, and the laws concerning perjury and divorce.

The best starting point for this study is Jesus' discussion of the law of divorce (Mk 10^{1-12}). The law of Moses which allowed divorce was framed because of the hardness of men's hearts. God's intention in creation was that marriage should be a lifelong partnership. This purpose was frustrated by 'hardness of heart,' and divorce became necessary to restrain men from slipping into the greater evil of promiscuity. But in the Kingdom where the forgiveness of sins provides an antidote to hardness of heart the original purpose of God is once more made possible of fulfilment. In the Kingdom, therefore, the law of divorce is repealed, not because it is unjustifiable but because it is unnecessary.

The same attitude to the law is to be found in

the Sermon on the Mount. The law against perjury, for example, is necessary if you expect a witness to tell lies whenever he feels sure of being able to do so with impunity. But it loses its point entirely when the witness is a man whose yes means yes and whose no means no, whether he is on oath or not (Mt 5^{33-37}).

The Christian, then, who has entered the Kingdom and draws upon its spiritual power, lives no longer under the law, but by the higher standards of grace. The State with all its machinery for the enforcement of its legal code represents a way of life in which evil is kept under restraint. But the Kingdom offers a way of life in which evil is defeated and banished. It is because Jesus was concerned mainly with the higher standards of the Kingdom that we find so little in His teaching about the law and the civil administration of justice. Yet in a world where hardness of heart persists, and where the powers of the Kingdom exercise their influence on society only in a gradual leavening process, law must have its place, and the State which administers the law must share in this limited justification.

These two institutions, then, the Temple and the State, have this much in common that they both belong to a pre-Christian or sub-Christian order. The functions allotted to them in Jesus' view of life were preparatory and subordinate to the operations of God's grace in the gospel, and both were superseded in the new life of the Kingdom of God.

Literature

OLD TESTAMENT TEXTUAL CRITICISM

THERE has long been need of a comprehensive handbook on the text of the Old Testament. For some years a more conservative attitude to the Massoretic Text has been apparent. Even before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls a reaction against irresponsible textual emendation had set in. It is early, of course, even to conjecture what will be the final results of the discovery, but it certainly gives added piquancy and timeliness to work on which the Rev. Bleddyn J. Roberts, M.A., B.D., Senior Lecturer in Biblical History and Literature in the University College of North Wales, has been engaged for some years, and which has now been published under the title *The Old Testament Text and Versions* (University of Wales Press; 21s. net). Mr. Roberts has had to face what might have been the disconcerting task of integrating the new material into work all ready for the press. That he has been able to do it without disjointedness is so much evidence for the validity of the conclusions to which his researches have led him.

The work, which is descriptive and historical, is divided into six parts, together with a 'Conclusion.' Part I deals with the Hebrew Bible, Part II with the Greek Versions, Part III with versions based on the Hebrew text, Part IV with translations based on the Septuagint, Part V with the Latin translations, and Part VI with the Arabic.

The general idea which the ordinary student of the Old Testament has of the subject may be summarized somewhat as follows. The Hebrew (Massoretic) Text has been copied with scrupulous accuracy ever since the Canon was finally determined at the end of the first century A.D. Between the times when the books were written and the end of the first century A.D. many corruptions crept into the text. The Septuagint is a translation of archetypes which go back to the third and second centuries B.C. Accordingly, where the Hebrew seems corrupt, it is a simple matter to translate the LXX, or some other version, back into Hebrew and so restore the 'original.' The actual position, as Mr. Roberts sees it, is much less simple. For one thing, the standard ben Asher text is the result of an editorial process extending over centuries. Hebrew grammar was gradually standardized, and the modern student, when he finds a passage which does not fit into it, resorts to emendation. In fact, materials like those from the Cairo Geniza and the Dead Sea Scrolls will make it become 'increasingly obvious that an adequate historico-grammatical study of the text will frequently obviate the need for textual emendation.' As for the versions, it will not do to translate them back into Hebrew and assume that we have the Hebrew text from which they were translated. Each version had its own history, each was subjected to inner corruptions, and each was to a large extent a paraphrase intended to make the Scriptures intelligible to people whose modes of thinking were not Hebrew. Thus, to suppose that Codex Vaticanus, on which editions of the LXX are usually based, is an uncorrupted literal translation of uncorrupted originals going back to the pre-Christian era, is in principle wrong. Actually, 'there is a remarkable lack of uniformity in the quality of the text (of B), which varies from book to book, and when the normally high standard

is lacking the text is deemed to be of very minor importance.'

It looks as though, in Lower as well as in Higher Criticism, we are on the way to a more comprehensive synthesis. This book gives Mr. Roberts an established reputation in the important branch of Old Testament study with which it deals. The Bibliography, which fills nearly thirty pages, is classified, and will be indispensable for further research in the subject.

C. R. North

TWO THOUSAND YEARS OF CHRISTIANITY

In a volume which bears the character of a symposium it is seldom that all the contributions reach the same level of excellence; but the level in *The Coming-of-Age of Christianity* (Canterbury Press; 12s. 6d. net) is uniformly high. The subject of the book is 'the achievements of Christianity during 2000 years and its prospects.' The contributors are John Foster, W. R. Matthews, Sydney Cave, A. D. Ritchie, K. S. Latourette, Stephen Neill, and H. P. Van Dusen. If we select from these contributions it is only because in so short a space it is impossible to outline them all.

The most vivid of them is the fact-packed section on 'The Achievement of Christ in Twenty Centuries' by Dr. John Foster. With a wealth of illustration he outlines what Christianity has done for the child and for the sufferer. 'The first medical missionary, Peter Parker, went from America to Canton in 1834. A hundred years later there were 306 Christian hospitals with nearly 22,000 beds, missionary doctors over 300, Chinese more than twice that number, nurses from the west also about 300, and Chinese nurses 1700. . . . In 1837 Parker accepted three Chinese as medical students. To-day the Christian Church provides six fully equipped medical colleges and seventy-nine centres for nurses' training.' In things of the mind Dr. Foster points out that translators of the Bible have provided alphabets and scripts for about three hundred languages. 'In the first six centuries the Bible found its way into eight languages. In the first sixteen centuries the figure mounted only to thirty. In our time the Bible is translated, wholly or in part, into one thousand one hundred and twenty languages.' This is a chapter of engrossing interest; it is the best kind of Christian apologetic because it lets the facts speak for themselves.

The most important chapter is that of Dr. W. R. Matthews on 'The Significance of Christ through the Ages.' With the hand of a master he outlines the historic Christologies and shows how they arose not so much as spontaneous affirmations as defences against erroneous and heretical views. He then goes on to suggest not a metaphysical but a psychological approach to Christology. 'The person and his activities of willing, knowing and feeling cannot be dissolved into a succession of impressions tied together by no "spiritual bond." We cannot dispense with the ego. Reflection on what happens in fully conscious willing and in the most thorough self-consciousness leads us to postulate "a subject who is never object," a "transcendental self" (the names which thinkers have chosen vary), some centre of consciousness, the ultimate knower and the originator of the deepest acts of will.' It is that very 'self' which is 'the point of contact with the eternal which is at the centre of self.' Through that self, Dr. Matthews suggests, an approach might be made to Christology. This is a suggestion of the most paramount importance.

Dr. Stephen Neill has an extremely useful chapter on 'The Union of the Churches.' He suggests seven foundation stones for a fully united Church. (1) It must be based on the Bible as the word of God. (2) It must have a ministry fully accepted in every part of it. (3) It must have some means—such as a general council in the ancient sense of the term—through which the authority of the whole Church can find expression. (4) It must be conscious of its unity as the Body of Christ and must have means by which that unity is expressed. (5) There must be room in it for variety in organization, in forms of worship, in relation to State and Nation, in ethos and inner character. (6) It must allow wide liberty of experiment in witness, in forms of Christian living and of service. (7) It must be recognized with all humility that not all the wisdom of men inspired by the Spirit of God can certainly keep the Church from heresy and division; and that therefore in the end there is no certain or mechanical means by which unity can be maintained. That is an extremely valuable analysis and ideal.

There is one misprint on p. 75 where the word 'age' appears upside down.

Taken altogether this is a book to awaken pride in the history of the Church and to stimulate thought for the Church's future.

William Barclay

THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE

The Foundations of the Christian Faith (Black; 10s. 6d. net), by the Rev. J. N. Sanders, M.A., Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge, who is both a theological lecturer and a parish priest, is described

in the sub-title as a study of the teaching of the New Testament in the light of historical criticism. The book originated in a course of popular lectures given in 1946, and is now published in the hope that there is room for a discussion of the central doctrines of the New Testament that appeals not so much to professional theologians as to college students and school teachers. While preparing his material for publication the author found himself so much at variance with Dr. Barnes in his recent book on 'The Rise of Christianity' that he has often joined issue with him, but in the field of critical pre-suppositions rather than that of critical methods. His own personal indebtedness is chiefly to J. M. Creed, E. G. Hoskyns, and C. H. Dodd.

By 'pre-suppositions' he means the unexamined and often virtually unconscious assumptions which we share with our contemporaries, which make up 'the climate of opinion,' and which colour all our thought. Such, for instance, is the postulate of which Dr. Barnes speaks as 'the large scale, or finite-scale, uniformity of nature which is fundamental in modern science,' and which rules out for him the possibility of miracles, in the Gospel narratives or elsewhere, in the sense of 'finite-scale activities contrary to the normal ordering of nature.' Mr. Sanders is, however, of the opinion that granted the existence of God it appears quite reasonable to say that normally the postulate of the uniformity of Nature holds good, and yet to add that, nevertheless, for a quite special purpose God did intervene in the world of Nature and of history with surprising, unpredictable, and unparalleled results.

We are not at all sure that Mr. Sanders has strengthened his pages by his frequent references to Dr. Barnes, especially as he gives no real impression of the contents of 'The Rise of Christianity' as a whole, and tends to exaggeration in expressing his objections to this work. Dr. Barnes must suffer the accusation that he is subject to 'characteristic incomprehension,' or that he is guilty of 'idolatry,' as 'worshipping a figment of his own imagination,' but he should not be accused of holding a philosophy that is 'naturalistic and materialistic in the extreme,' a 'thinly disguised materialism.'

The strength of the book under review is not its handling of Dr. Barnes but its careful and competent interpretation of New Testament doctrine in the light of historical criticism. It restricts itself to an examination of the teaching of Jesus and that of Paul, of the author of Hebrews, and of the Fourth Evangelist, concentrating on Christology as being the absolutely central thing in New Testament doctrine. Because they do not in his opinion contribute anything new to Christology Mr. Sanders does not spend time discussing the Epistles ascribed to Peter, James, John, and Jude.

The core of the book is its representation of the Apostolic *kerygma*, the faith as preached, as the unifying element in the New Testament. (Viewed from the standpoint of its hearers, the *kerygma* is the *evangelion*.) It is even contended that if the *kerygma* is taken away nothing is left of the New Testament; because the *didachē*, the instruction of the believer as distinct from the proclamation to the unbeliever, whether as it is found in the Pauline Epistles or in the Gospels, presupposes the *kerygma*. This is the thesis behind the affirmation that 'if we cannot understand Jesus in the light of traditional Christianity, then he remains ultimately unintelligible.'

In adopting such a standpoint Mr. Sanders apparently follows Dr. C. H. Dodd, and there can be no doubt but that in adopting it he has a strong weapon to hand that may at once free him from the shackles of fundamentalism and enable him to probe weaknesses in the constructions of 'advanced' critics like Dr. Barnes. For it does look as though some such interpretation of the New Testament as is outlined in this book must enter into a Christian apologetic that, while modern, conserves traditional belief.

W. FULTON

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH SOCINIANISM

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES recently contained a brief review of 'Essays and Addresses' by Emeritus Principal H. McLachlan. His son, the Rev. H. John McLachlan, M.A., B.D., D.Phil., tutor and librarian of Manchester College, Oxford, has in turn given us *Socinianism in Seventeenth-Century England* (Cumberlege; 25s. net). The work of the son has like qualities to that of the father. Both write limpid English, both have obviously carried out diligent research, both evince a like meticulous scholarship, and both offer interesting and valuable augmentation of our knowledge.

In English ecclesiastical history the seventeenth century was stormy and in many points obscure. It is well known how many strange sects emerged to light when under the Civil War and Cromwell there disappeared most restraint upon eccentric interpretations of the one Scripture to which all, or nearly all, fancied they were doing justice. It was a period when men felt themselves free to examine critically much that the preceding century had taken for granted and dogmatically affirmed.

Before Cromwell's time, however, there had taken deep root the movement named after

an early leader—Socinianism. Dr. McLachlan naturally begins with the story of Socinianism on the Continent, and his account is concise and for his purpose thoroughly adequate. Next he brings out that while some direct influence of Poland did exist, it was rather haphazard, depending mainly on a few Englishmen who had visited Poland and brought back with them news of the new movement. It was Holland, however, that was the main source of Socinian influence in England. That is set down in great detail as also are the opinions of the Englishmen who were affected. Quite a number both among Churchmen and Dissenters were to some degree so influenced, but not all in precisely the same way. Some denounced as 'Socinians' were rather Arians or even Sabellians. There was such fierce wrath roused at the very name 'Socinian' that many sympathizers with some part of Socinianism carefully kept their views, as publicly expressed, rather ambiguous. To get at an estimate of the real extent to which Socinian views were disseminated our author has delved into surviving contemporary manuscripts, as well as exploring the libraries for long-forgotten printed material.

He impresses upon us convincingly that in dealing with Socinianism as it existed in the century under review we must distinguish two aspects. First, there was the doctrinal position. As to that there was considerable variety. Second, there was the *ethos*. Socinians were all at one there. They were not alone in contending, but they notably contended, for that liberty of conscience which the Reformation originally seemed to claim and to grant, but which in a few years seemed to have merely been a 'liberty' to adopt one intolerant dogmatism for another. The Socinians' greatest service lay then in striving for toleration, freedom, and the rights of reason.

Dr. McLachlan makes one very interesting suggestion, which to the writer is new, on the difficult question as to why so many congregations of Dissenters, Presbyterians and others, passed over to Unitarianism. He suggests that it was because in their worship they had only metrical versions of the Old Testament Psalms to sing, no repetition of a Creed, no prescribed 'orthodox' prayers. In that, in my opinion, he has 'got something.' If you ask why then did nothing comparable happen in Scotland? I fancy that part of the answer is that England never took *The Shorter Catechism* to its very heart as Scotland did.

W. D. NIVEN

PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CARE OF SOULS

The author of *Pastoral Psychology*: A Study in the Care of Souls (Allen and Unwin; 15s. net), the Rev. Göte Bergsten, is a Swedish psychologist of repute who is in the service of the Christian Church as Superintendent of the Institute for Psychology and Spiritual Counsel in Stockholm. As his previous ministerial work included also a period of service as Chaplain to a Mental Asylum his experience has equipped him usefully for his task, which is to set forth the relationship which ought to obtain between psychology and the pastoral care of souls. He proceeds learnedly and cautiously, but is uneasy about the actual relationship. He is apprehensive of the deterministic exclusiveness of psychology on the one hand, and, on the other, of the pastor's ignorance of both the normal and abnormal working of the minds of those whose souls he seeks to save.

It is a pity that this book could not have been read in its original Swedish form, for the author has not been very well served in the English translation. The style is difficult, the writer's fondness for rather disconnected short sentences does not make clear the sequence of the thought, and the plan of the book as a whole is rather incoherent. His main purpose is to show that there need be no antagonism between psychology and religion, and that fuller mutual knowledge is necessary, but he is rather apt to be repetitive in his generalizations. He rings the changes on the idea that a little knowledge is a dangerous thing, but he does not show very effectively how the connecting knowledge is to be obtained.

One of the most interesting parts of the book is the historical introduction in which the author traces the development from primitive Christianity to the mediaeval officializing of the care of souls. He also tries to estimate the prevailing tendencies of the present time, lamenting the lack of assurance on the part of ministers and teachers, and hinting at a fear lest they should in their amateurish dabbling in psychology be simply trying to reinvigorate their own faith 'by grafting on to it some young shoot from the tree of science.' In the course of his efforts to make it clear that psychology and the care of souls are independent disciplines he makes a useful distinction between 'sin' and 'symptoms,' and warns us against explaining away the former by over-emphasizing the latter. The same line of thought leads him to an illuminating differentiation between fear of punishment and a sense of guilt. The first is often confused with the second but is not really religious and has reference primarily to our material environment, whereas the latter is intelligible only if it moves within the sphere of personal fellowship and ultimately relates itself to a religious fundamental Reality and the need of forgiveness from, and reconciliation with, a God invested with the characters of personality and fatherly love.

A most useful chapter deals with opportunities a pastor may have in dealing with those who are mentally abnormal, and in mediating between their suspicious relatives and the authorities who tend to concentrate on medical treatment and feel also that they have responsibilities in protecting the community from unrestrained neurotics. At this point the interesting question of religious neutrality is raised, and leads on to one of the key notions of the book, that the pastor, while carefully refraining from any propaganda which might increase emotional tension, must honour the conviction—which the author bases firmly on his own experience—that 'people struggling with mental affliction derive marked benefit from a positive spiritual ministry,' and that 'there is no such thing as neutrality in the relations between human beings.' One might sum up the teaching of the book by saying that it is strongly Barthian in stressing the need of religious objectivity, but equally strongly anti-Barthian in that it accuses this school of thought of being disastrously escapist in ignoring the necessity and obligation of psychological knowledge.

W. S. URQUHART

THE METHODIST HERITAGE

Of the making of books about Methodism there seems to be no end, but *The Methodist Heritage*, by the Rev. Henry Carter, C.B.E. (Epworth Press; 15s. net), is a book with a difference. It derives its ultimate inspiration from a knowledge of Continental Protestantism gained during the author's work amongst European refugees; and its purpose is to provide, by a fresh appraisal of the original mission and message of Methodism in the light of 'Amsterdam,' an up-to-date assessment of the distinctive obligations and responsibilities of Methodism to the Universal Church of the future.

Methodism finds its roots in the 'conversion' of John and Charles Wesley in May 1738, and their discovery of 'the straight way to the religion of love, even by faith.' The spiritual pilgrimage of the Wesleys to their decisive hour was long and tortuous, and their guides were many. Not only did they inherit in unique fashion the best both of Church and Dissent (and how strikingly 'the pretty ways o' Providence' are displayed in their ancestry through Samuel Wesley and Susanna Annesley), but in the hours of crisis they came under the influence, direct or indirect, of Luther, Peter Böhler, and the Moravians.

All this had certain important consequences for our day as well as for their own, for Methodist worship, fellowship, and social work, all derive their character, from May, 1738. Wesley's emphasis was on 'experimental' religion—experimental in relation both to God and to man. Here is Methodism's genius, and it is admirably expounded in these pages with clarity, accuracy, and authority. And those who remember Mr. Carter as an ardent temperance reformer will not be surprised that his treatment of the social outworkings of Methodism should find him in his happiest vein.

This book, therefore, is timely. It will recall Methodists themselves to first principles, and in so doing it will make a valuable background for the great Ecumenical Methodist Conference to be held in Oxford in August next; and to other Christians it will give a picture of Methodism in its true colours, so to speak—a picture which will dispel many illusions and misunderstandings, and so form a basis for a sound judgment as to the contribution of Methodism to the World Church, 'the great new fact of our age.'

WESLEY F. SWIFT

It seems that in India a sixtieth birthday is something of an event. And Radhakrishnan has attained to that. A galaxy of scholars, seizing their chance, have presented him with a volume of essays in recognition of his distinction as a thinker and a writer. Few men deserve such an honour more than this fine scholar with his very wide knowledge of his own Indian inheritance, and of other literatures almost no less, with his enviable catholicity of mind, and his adroit and captivating pen. For few have done more to help East and West to understand each other.

They are a goodly company who make the offering. The editorial board consists of Inge and Jacks, Hiriyanna and Raju and Burtt, while the contributors, nineteen in all, include such names as Dasgupta and Bouquet. *Radhakrishnan: Comparative Studies in Philosophy Presented in Honour of his Sixtieth Birthday* (Allen and Unwin; 25s. net).

The essays differ widely in subject, and perhaps also in value. But one is glad that this tribute was paid to so lovable a spirit. There is a striking portrait, for which one is grateful.

Professor G. J. Renier, Ph.D., who holds the Chair of Dutch History and Institutions in the University of London, has written a new book entitled *History, Its Purpose and Method* (Allen and Unwin; 15s. net). As to the author, he is obviously a scholar of wide erudition. He is as familiar with the thought of French, German, and Italian scholars as with English, American, and Dutch. He knows all he needs to know about

Psychology, Sociology, Philosophy, Science, and Religion.

For so learned a man he writes with amazing lightness of touch, and nearly every page has its gem of wit. Take one example out of a multitude that might be cited—' The man in whose mind a doubt about reality can arise was not born to be an historian. He was destined for philosophy, or for a nervous breakdown ' (p. 158).

Dr. Renier is, one gathers, as to his own philosophical position, a Pragmatist. He follows Henri Pirenne, his first master, and acknowledges his debt to F. C. S. Schiller, A. Sidgwick, W. James, and John Dewey. In fact this book of his own is the first serious attempt that has been made to bring ' History ' into the Pragmatist ' Encyclopædia.' What is ' History ' ? According to our author it is primarily and all the time the accurate story which preserves the memory of the past experience of human societies. Other definitions are criticized and the views of, for example, Croce and Collingwood pungently handled. There follows discussion of the methodology of the historian. Many interesting points are suggestively, sometimes provocatively, treated. This magazine is not the place in which to enter into details of Dr. Renier's views. It is, however, open to us to express our opinion that he has given us a work of great interest and importance, a work which most teachers and all students of history will read and ponder to their immense profit.

The Gospel of St. Mark (Hodder and Stoughton ; 6s. net) is a new translation in simple English from the Greek text edited by Nestlé. The aim of the translator, the Rev. Edward Vernon (a minister of the Church of Scotland at Ranfurly, Bridge of Weir), has been to produce a version combining simplicity with accuracy that would be readily understood by those of twelve years and over. Mr. Vernon is to be congratulated on the remarkable success with which he has achieved his aim while still maintaining propriety and dignity of style. The Marcan Gospel is here printed as a continuous narrative, divided into chapters of a convenient length for devotional or class purposes. At the top of each page the corresponding portion in the Authorized Version is indicated.

We have to announce that a fourth edition (entirely reset) of a well-known theological manual first published in 1936 has now appeared—*In Understanding Be Men* (Inter-Varsity Fellowship ; 6s. net), by Archdeacon T. C. Hammond, M.A., Principal of Moore Theological College, Sydney. The book is written in non-technical terms for the ordinary non-theological reader. The standpoint is conservative and evangelical. In this edition the text has been further revised and the format completely changed.

Mr. A. D. Power, whose work on the Proverb-literature is well known, has followed up his recent translation of Proverbs with a delightful little study entitled *Side Lights on the Book of Proverbs* (Longmans ; 3s. 6d. net). It contains twelve short studies dealing with such matters as words and phrases, idioms, and figures of speech, together with parallels between Proverbs and similar literature from the Ancient East, the Greek and Latin classics, and modern English. Mr. Power has the requisite sense of humour, and a flair for the *bon mot*. He remarks that to appreciate a proverb fully ' it must be detached and considered by itself at leisure ; for brief proverbs cannot be absorbed unless taken in small doses.' To read these studies is to put one's self in the way of appreciating the ' wisdom ' content of literature generally.

The Rev. H. V. Martin, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., is the author of two books on Kierkegaard—*Kierkegaard, The Melancholy Dane* (Epworth Press ; 7s. 6d. net) and *The Wings of Faith* (Lutterworth Press ; 7s. 6d. net). Both were published in 1950, and the former is No. 3 in the ' Philosophers' Library ' series. In the first of these Dr. Martin sets forth the story of Kierkegaard's life, presents methodically the basic ideas of his thought with helpful commentary upon his difficult terminology, and considers the values of his contribution to theology to-day. In the second book Dr. Martin expounds a single theme—which is also a primary one—in Kierkegaard's theology. What is Kierkegaard's account of the nature and meaning of faith, of faith as the act by which one becomes, and exists as, a Christian ? The four chapters that offer an answer to this question deal successively with the problem, the object, the nature, and the life of Christian faith. The two books are modest in size—the Epworth Press volume has a hundred and fourteen pages, the Lutterworth Press volume a hundred and thirty pages. They are attractively printed and the style of the writing is clear. Primarily their aim is descriptive ; they seek to describe and clarify the main points in a theological writer whose own books are voluminous and involved. In this aim Dr. Martin has achieved considerable success. His two books can be a very serviceable introduction, for the general reader and for students, to ' the theology of the unconditional ' as Kierkegaard would describe his own position. Dr. Martin tells us that he ' discovered in this

Danish thinker a man after my own heart,' and it is from the angle of a wholehearted acceptance of the Kierkegaardian point of view that he speaks and describes in these books. The critical reader therefore of Dr. Martin's presentation is likely to find at times an over hasty dismissal of difficulties seriously argued and defended in opposing views; but the final word should be praise for a very informative piece of exposition. Both books merit the designation '*multum in parvo*.'

Receive This Child (Mowbray; 3s. net), by the Rev. Ernest Southcott, Vicar of St. Wilfrid's, Halton, Leeds, is a plea for constructive thinking on Baptism. In the Foreword the Bishop of Ripon commends it as making a real contribution to the practical problems that gather round this Sacrament. In the Introduction the Bishop of Knaresborough commends it as raising the two questions: (1) Are we the Body of Christ, or just a group of people who go to Church? (2) Have we a Parish policy? The booklet itself is a product of the vicar's intimate experience of parochial work, and earnest reflection upon it.

The Religious Education Press is issuing a new 'Pathfinder' series of class books under the editorship of Dr. F. S. Popham. The series is designed to meet the needs of teachers and pupils in middle forms of Grammar Schools and upper classes in Secondary Modern Schools. The second volume in the series to appear is *The Book of the Acts*, by Mr. M. D. R. Willink, S.Th. (3s. net). It is described as 'a little commentary on a record of high adventure.' The commentary is lively as well as informative, and a valuable feature of it for its purpose is the wisdom and moderation of its apologetic standpoint. Nor should we fail of appreciative reference to the wealth of modern instance that is drawn upon to illuminate the course of the history of the Early Church. The commentary is supplemented with six illustrative maps, and at the end of each chapter is a list of questions and points for discussion.

The Fullness of Christ (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net) is a study of the Church's Growth into Catholicity presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury. It will be remembered that some five years ago the Archbishop invited a group of Anglicans of the 'Catholic' school of thought to consider certain questions, as a result of which they produced the Report entitled 'Catholicity.' Later a similar invitation was issued to some Anglicans of the 'Evangelical' school of thought and to some leaders of the Free Churches. From the Free Church side has already come a volume entitled 'The Catholicity of Protestantism,' and following closely upon it there has come a volume, now before us, produced by Evangelicals of the Church of England, entitled *The Fullness of Christ*. This Third Report, as the Archbishop comments, makes an eirenic attempt to account for the contrasts of 'Catholic' and 'Protestant' theology, and is careful to uphold that the Church of England is in the proper sense Protestant as well as Catholic. At the same time it seeks to indicate, as the Archbishop continues, how there may be reconciliation of apparently opposed truths and a fellowship which embraces large varieties of emphasis. And he concludes that the careful perusal of all three documents will greatly promote understanding and assist concord, though he cannot venture to say that the time for full reunion is as yet in sight.

It Can be Done, by Mr. Thomas A. Jefferies, M.Sc., F.L.S. (J. K. Whitehead, London; 5s. net), is described as a practical handbook for leaders of Young People's Departments in the modern Sunday School. The Young People's Department is defined as consisting of those between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five. The book has two very great merits. First, it regards that age as the time when 'personality is finding itself and developing.' Its stress therefore is not so much on the insertion of knowledge into the young person's mind as on teaching that young person to think for himself or herself. 'The finest teacher is not he who gives the most brilliant exposition of his subject, but he who evokes the best discussion.' 'Even when speakers are really good it still remains a fact that they make little impression because listening is such a passive thing.' It must not be thought that the writer desires to leave young people simply with a series of questions. The balance is well maintained because the supreme importance of each day's summing up is strongly stressed. Second, the whole standpoint of this book is pre-eminently practical. It does not disdain to speak of how to arrange flowers and seating and how to decorate a room. Again and again it goes into the greatest detail. It runs the danger sometimes of appearing to deal with details which seem to be trivial but, in truth, these details are not trivial, for out of such details there comes perfection. This is a book from which any youth leader cannot fail to find some useful and practical advice.

The book is notably well indexed and there is a useful bibliography to each chapter for further reading and study.

Living Issues in Biblical Scholarship

The Church and the Ministry

By the Reverend Vincent Taylor, Ph.D., D.D., Principal of Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds

I

In recent years, in connexion with the great œcumenical movements towards Church Unity, it has been widely felt to be a mistake to set the divisive subject of the Christian Ministry in the central arena of debate until the prior question of the nature of the Church had been fully discussed. This point of view was impressively adopted in Dr. R. N. Flew's important work, *Jesus and His Church* [1938, 2nd ed. 1943], and with the most beneficial results; but, with the subsequent publication of a series of notable books, this stage in the discussion may be said definitely to have come to an end. These writings include *The Apostolic Ministry* [1946], edited by Bishop Kirk; *The Gift of Ministry* [1947], by Daniel Jenkins; *The Church's Ministry* [1948], by T. W. Manson; *Problems of Reunion* [1950], by the Bishop of Derby; and *The Catholicity of Protestantism* [1950], edited by R. N. Flew and R. E. Davies. Among other publications too numerous to chronicle may be mentioned *The Lambeth Conference Report of 1948*, *The Scheme of Church Union in Ceylon* [1949], and *Church Relations in England* [1950], the last named being the Report of conversations between representatives of the Archbishop of Canterbury and those of the Evangelical Free Churches in England. Manifestly, a new period has begun in which renewed attention must be given to the nature of the Christian Ministry by all who have the interests of Church Unity at heart.

It is of incalculable advantage that, thanks to the diligent study of the nature of the Church mentioned above, and to allied studies regarding the Kingdom of God, the Son of Man, and the Sacrifice of Christ, we can now approach the question of the Christian Ministry in a different setting and a different spirit. This problem, difficult as it is, is no longer an arid academic discussion limited to the study of New Testament texts and to the interrogation of ambiguous passages in the writings of the Fathers of the second and third centuries. These inquiries are still of vital importance, but they can now be pursued in the context of fervent Christian belief concerning the Ecclesia as the Body of Christ, the Beloved Community, which receives the Word of God, worships and proclaims Christ as Lord, and maintains and observes the Sacraments of His appointing. The Word, the *kerygma*, and liturgy have become touchstones by which conceptions of the ministry are tested. In this atmosphere of thought it is intolerable to think of the Christian minister merely as a properly accredited Church officer, and still less as an irresponsible individual who presumes to take the ministerial office upon himself. Almost universally it is felt that no conception of the Ministry is adequate or worthy which does not claim that it is the continuation of the essential ministry of Christ, inspired by the Holy Spirit, and authorized by the Church through representatives who embody its tradition and share in its life.

II

Every one must wish that it were possible to discuss the Christian Ministry without debate concerning Apostolic Succession in the more familiar and technical sense of that term; for, as the result of the continued study of the Scriptures, we are becoming increasingly aware of the truth of a more vital conception of succession. The Biblical basis of this doctrine is Ac 2^{42}: 'And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers.' Here is described a vital succession of those, whether laymen or ministers, who are faithful to Apostolic faith and practice, founded upon the teaching of Christ Himself, and maintained through the centuries by an unbroken chain of witnesses and confessors; and, with modifications required by their special functions, Christian ministers may find in this conception a true and a valid succession. It may be doubted, however, whether Church representatives can avoid a renewed consideration of the more technical theory of Apostolic Succession, inasmuch as it bears so vitally upon all schemes of union and intercommunion, and all the more in view of the challenge raised by *The Apostolic Ministry* and 'the substantial minority' of bishops who are not able at present to enter into communion with the Church of South India. The claims made by those who accept this theory are so absolute that, where they are accepted, union between episcopal and non-episcopal communions is impossible; and, even, when they are rejected, it may still be that practical proposals to 'try out episcopacy'

are still deeply affected by them. For this reason the Church is under the regrettable necessity of facing this issue, which cannot be avoided by well-intentioned subtlety or evasion.

It is not necessary in this article to describe in detail the arguments put forward in *The Apostolic Ministry*, beyond those concerned with the interesting distinction between the Essential Ministry and the Dependent Ministry, and the use made of the term *shaliach* in its bearing on the nature of the Apostolic commission received and transmitted. The Essential Ministry is held to be that established by Christ in the Apostolate and the Dependent Ministry that appointed and commissioned by the Apostles. Non-episcopal ministries are described as 'invalid,' because they have broken away from the Catholic succession and do not satisfy the conditions laid down by competent authority, in particular, ordination by bishops who stand in lineal succession with the original Essential Ministry. A 'valid' ministry, it is maintained, is indispensable, for, without it, 'the apostolic Church, which is the Body of Christ in space and time, would disappear with it (for the two are inextricably bound together), and the whole preaching of the Gospel message to the nations would be in the utmost jeopardy.'[1] The non-episcopal Churches are not asked to accept 'the Historic Episcopate' in the precise form in which it exists to-day, but to receive the principle of continuity embedded in it, the commission of the apostle or *shaliach* to act in our Lord's own Person.[2] Such is the thesis presented in this remarkable volume by Dr. Kirk, and worked out in its historical, expository, and theological aspects in the chapters by Dr. A. M. Farrer, Dom Gregory Dix, and Father Hebert.[3]

The basic conception on which the argument depends is that of the apostle as the *shaliach*, or envoy of Christ. Derived from Rabbinic usage, this term describes an accredited representative, in accordance with the frequently quoted saying of the Rabbis, 'for a man's *shaliach* is as it were himself.' As *sheluchim*, it is contended, the Apostles were given the authority of Christ Himself, and it is this authority which by consecration and ordination has been transmitted to bishops and elders and handed down to their successors throughout the centuries.[4] This argument is wholly fallacious. In his detailed study in *The Church's Ministry* Dr. T. W. Manson has shown that the authority of the *shaliach* does not extend beyond his terms of reference, and that it lapses when his commission has been fulfilled. His authority cannot be transferred to another; when he ceases to exercise it, it reverts to the principal. *Shaliach* is a term of function, not status, and so far as the function is religious, it is exercised within the borders of Judaism and does not involve missionary activity. The Twelve, Dr. Manson maintains, were not the only representatives sent out by Jesus, and in so far as they had a special status, it was personal and inalienable.[5] The new arguments cannot be said to have shaken the views of the greatest of Anglican scholars, Lightfoot,[6] Westcott,[7] and Hort,[8] en-

[1] *The Apostolic Ministry*, 40.

[2] 'If we agree about orders, we can compromise to an unlimited extent upon organization; indeed, the more the bishop can be disentangled from the machine and left to feed the flock, the better for him, for them, and for the whole Church,' *op. cit.*, 52.

[3] In tone and temper these discussions are excellent, with occasional lapses, as in the claim of Dom Gregory Dix that 'where the doctrine of "Justification by faith alone" is held, no question of Church order can be anything but entirely secondary, even meaningless' (p. 301), in the disparagement of Bishop Headlam's *The Doctrine of the Church and Reunion* and of Canon Streeter's *The Primitive Church*, and in the pervading view that the Lambeth Quadrilateral needs to be supplemented by a sacerdotal conception of the Church and the Ministry.

[4] The contributors give the impression that in this idea they have made somewhat of 'a find' (*v.* p. 229 n.). They refer to the discussions of Billerbeck, Rengstorf, Kohler, and F. Gavin, but do not mention those of Kirsopp Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, v. [1933] 48–52, and of R. N. Flew, *Jesus and His Church*, 108–110.

[5] 'It would be forfeited by misconduct; but it could not be transmitted to another. It did not pass at death' (*op. cit.*, 51).

[6] Of the Ignatian conception of the episcopate, Lightfoot wrote: 'It need hardly be remarked how subversive of the true spirit of Christianity, in the negation of individual freedom and the consequent suppression of direct responsibility to God in Christ, is the crushing despotism with which this language, if taken literally, would invest the episcopal office' (*The Christian Ministry*, 87 f.).

[7] In a letter to Mr. Llewelyn Davies, Westcott wrote: 'I cannot find any basis for the High Church theory in the New Testament. It is based, as far as I can see, on assumed knowledge of what the divine plan must be. . . . The very condition laid down for the Apostolate excludes the idea of the perpetuation of their office' (cited from J. H. Moulton, *The Christian Religion in the Study and the Street* [1919], 106).

[8] 'In the Apostolic age we have seen that the offices instituted in the Ecclesia were the creation of successive experiences and changes of circumstance. . . . There is no trace in the New Testament that any ordinances on this subject were prescribed by the Lord, or that any such ordinances were set up permanently binding by the Twelve or by St. Paul or by the Ecclesia at large. Their faith in the Holy Spirit and His perpetual guidance was too much of a reality to make that possible' (*The Christian Ecclesia*, 230).

dorsed in 1920 by Dr. Headlam.[1] They represent a minority view in the Church of England, and constitute the most serious obstacle to reunion and intercommunion in Great Britain.

Exhaustive critical investigations[2] have failed to bridge two gaps in the succession of the earliest missionaries and teachers—that between the Twelve and the rest of the Apostles, and that between the Apostles and the Elders and their successors. The Apostles are the more inclusive body, including not only the Twelve, but also James, the Lord's brother, Paul, Barnabas, Silvanus, Andronicus, and Junias. It cannot be said that the Apostles form a homogeneous group, those of Jerusalem and Antioch being in important respects distinct. The Jerusalem Apostles, with Paul, stand apart from all others in dignity and authority, in virtue of the fact that they had seen the Lord and that most of them belonged to the Twelve. As such, they had not, and could not have, successors comparable to themselves. 'Elders' are chosen or appointed for the Churches of Galatia by Barnabas and Paul (Ac 14^{23})[3]; but the evidence is far indeed from supporting the theory of an unbroken succession between them and the Apostles. In many cases, 'Elders' will have been appointed by Apostles by the laying on of hands, but we cannot assume that this was an invariable practice. We have rather to allow for a period of relative fluidity, during which 'Apostolicity' became a mark of the Church itself, with the result that, at various centres, authorization was given to those who were recognized as possessing the call of the Spirit for the ministerial office.

[1] Headlam argued that our Lord 'did not directly institute or command Episcopacy.' 'We cannot claim that it is essential to the Church. Equally it is clear that there is no Apostolic ordinance to be quoted in its support. There is no adequate or sufficient evidence that it was instituted by the Apostles. We must recognize that the authority that can be claimed for it is so far limited' (*The Doctrine of the Church and Reunion*, 106). Dr. Headlam's positive contention is that Episcopacy, 'really forms the best basis for Christian unity.' On *The Apostolic Ministry*, see further the comments of the Bishop of Derby, *Problems of Reunion*, 48.

[2] Cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 92–101; K. H. Rengstorf, 'Απόστολος, in Kittel's *Theologisches Worterbuch z. N.T.*, i. 406–44; 'The Twelve and the Apostles' in K. Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, v. 37–59; R. N. Flew, *Jesus and His Church*, 106–20; J. Munck, 'Paul, the Apostles, and the Twelve,' *Studia Theologica*, iii. Fasc. 1. 96–110 [Lund, 1950].

[3] 1 Ti 4^{14} speaks of 'the spiritual gift' imparted to Timothy through prophecy 'with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery,' and 2 Ti 1^{6} represents Paul, reminding him to rekindle 'the gift of God' 'through the laying on of my hands.'

III

It is a relief to turn from the discussion of Apostolic Succession, and from allied technical questions, to the Cambridge sermon of the Archbishop of Canterbury on 3rd November, 1946. Its main theme, it is to be hoped, is well known, and it will only be necessary to refer to the main points of interest.

Dr. Fisher's opinion that at present the way to constitutional union is beset with insuperable difficulties will command respect. The Church of England is 'the nodal point' of the world-wide Anglican communion, and has tensions within itself which are not yet resolved. In these circumstances the Archbishop suggested a way for closer fellowship and intercommunion between the Churches. The non-Episcopal Churches, he observed, have accepted the principle that episcopacy must exist along with other elements in a reunited Church. He therefore suggested that they should 'try out' episcopacy on their own ground by taking it into their system, and in this way begin to grow through intercommunion and fellowship towards full communion. 'For full communion,' he said, 'there is needed a ministry mutually acknowledged by all as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit but also the authority which each Church in conscience requires.'[4] If there were agreement on such a venture, he declared, he would thankfully receive at the hands of others their commission in their accustomed form and 'in the same way confer our own'; 'that is the mutual exchange of love and enrichment to which Lambeth, 1920, called us.'

Of the nobility of this plea there can be no question. The conversations which followed were of the same high order. In the Report the Evangelical Free Churches are asked to analyse and discuss the underlying principles rather than to pass judgment upon the proposal at once, until, after the interval of at least a year, the Church of England shall have done so. Short of this wise proviso, the proposals are open for discussion and elucidation, and it is suggested that it is in every way desirable that in groups and in conferences they should be carefully and sympathetically considered.

The root question, of course, is episcopacy; for, on the allied questions of Scripture, doctrine, and the sacraments, there is wide and substantial agreement, with differences of interpretation regarding the sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion. In the conversations it was agreed that the essential functions of bishops in the main traditions of the Church are (1) those of ordination, (2) decision, in concurrence with presbyters and

[4] *Church Relations in England*, 10.

laity, in any suggested changes in the matter of doctrine, and (3) pastoral oversight over ministers and congregations. Without making confirmation a condition of intercommunion, the Anglican representatives expressed the hope that, episcopally administered, it would 'in due course come to be widely, and in the end generally, used in the Free Churches.' A point of the greatest importance is added in the recognition that 'the Free Church, though itself episcopal or in process of becoming episcopal, would yet continue to maintain the relations of fellowship and intercommunion which it at present enjoys with non-episcopal Churches.'[1]

What answers on both sides to these proposals will be made remains to be seen, and every one is rightly anxious that no premature decisions should render further advances impossible. In what follows, attention will be limited to the grave matters which will call for the closest attention among Free Churchmen. It cannot be anything but salutary to state these as clearly as possible.

For Free Churchmen the vital issue is that of 'taking episcopacy into their system.' It is frequently observed that in Moderators, General Superintendents, and Chairmen of Districts, the Free Churches have already set aside *pastores pastorum*, whose functions in certain respects approximate to those exercised by bishops in the Early Church. It may even be contended that these officers represent episcopacy in one of its most primitive forms. This contention is not without force; but there is a significant difference which must be noted. Moderators and Superintendents have no exclusive powers of ordination and confirmation, and any attempt to invest them with these powers in the development of Free Church organization would be strenuously resisted and almost certainly rejected. The Free Church practice and position is that any minister already ordained may take part in these sacred rites. The proposal, therefore, that Free Churchmen should adopt episcopacy is a complete reversal of their present practice; and, in consequence, it is one they would have to justify in their own minds. It is frequently said that no theory of episcopacy is enjoined, and that Free Churchmen, like Anglicans, may interpret it in their own way. It must be seriously doubted, however, whether any communion ought to accept episcopacy without an agreed theory of its nature corresponding to its functions. In this matter the contributors to *The Apostolic Ministry* have right on their side.

It is difficult not to think that a system which gives to the bishop the exclusive right of ordination and confirmation does not ultimately imply Apostolic Succession in the technical sense of the term. Those who already have episcopacy in their Church order may avoid this inference by accepting it and valuing it as a system justified by long usage, and as expressive of the unity of the Church. It is much more difficult for the Free Churches to take this view when they are invited to take episcopacy into their system for the first time. They are bound to feel that, in accepting it, with the functions described, they are accepting a practice which confines ministerial authority, and the communication of grace necessary to its discharge, to a particular channel, and, in consequence, a view which implies that non-episcopal ministries are not valid ministries, since they do not conform to the necessary conditions laid down by the Church. The same problem arises in the matter of confirmation. Even the suggestion that bishops might 'delegate' the right to confirm to presbyters,[2] implies that it is through bishops alone that the grace of confirmation can be conferred. There may be ways of meeting these difficulties, but it is essential on both sides to recognize that they exist and are serious.

Practical difficulties also present themselves. Presbyterians and Free Churchmen believe that it is a particular merit of their existing Church order that all their ministers, including Moderators and Presidents, are of the same status. Parity of status has contributed markedly to their undoubted unity, and it is naturally felt that to take episcopacy into their system might give rise to disorders from which happily hitherto they have been spared. From their knowledge of history they are compelled to estimate differently the claim that episcopacy makes for unity, inasmuch as the division between East and West, the Reformation, and the rise of Presbyterianism, Independency, and Methodism, while due to many causes, all coincided with the existence of episcopal government in the Church. Further, the proposal to give a form of commission to non-episcopal ministers, short of re-ordination, is sure to give rise to many difficulties, as the form suggested in the Scheme of Church Union in Ceylon shows.[3] It is not easy for those who are accustomed to an episcopal system to realize how far-reaching its adoption would be in the Free Churches. Even the suggestion of a mutual exchange of ministerial commissions, noble and large-minded as it is, must raise difficulties. In Free Church opinion episcopal ministries are already valid ministries of Christ, and such a commission as they might give would be no more than a public recognition of this fact. If, however, their own ministries were not regarded as valid, a further commission would mark them as defective and invalid.

In the light of the difficulties outlined above it

[1] *Op. cit.*, 45.

[2] *Church Relations in England*, 40.

[3] *Scheme of Church Union in Ceylon*, 21.

will not be surprising if there are those on both sides, Anglican and Free Church, who will fear that the Archbishop's proposal, so excellent in spirit, so bold in conception, might disintegrate their existing systems and impair their service in the Church of Christ. So great is the need of a disordered world that it is fervently to be hoped that a way may be found to overcome these fears and perils, and no pains can be spared toward this end, since intercommunion and ultimate union are the will of God.

IV

What, it may be asked in conclusion, is the alternative, if the present proposals fail? That great Welsh advocate, the late Mr. Llewelwyn Williams, often began his speeches at the Bar by asking the jury to consider the case at its worst. Let the question, then, be asked, suppose either the Church of England or the Free Churches rejected the Archbishop's suggestion, what would follow? I think we may say that for a long time to come no further advance would be possible. The more pessimistic would say that we should reach a dead end. I do not agree, for it is impossible to stay the urge of the Spirit, if intercommunion and union are the will of God. Is there then no alternative to the present suggestions?

By general consent federation is not good enough, and constitutional union is at present not possible; what, then, of *integration*? There is a way to intercommunion, beset with great difficulties, if we are courageous enough to undertake it. Why cannot the several Churches recognize each other as living organisms within the Church of God, and their ministries as valid ministries in the conditions of a divided Church? The Free Churches would have little difficulty in giving a public affirmation on this issue. The greater problem would present itself to the Church of England. There are many within the Church of England who could give here and now such an affirmation, but that communion as a whole could not do so, until it has resolved the tensions in its own body on the questions of Apostolic Succession and the sacramental nature of ordination and confirmation. So far, it has avoided this issue, knowing full well that even a majority decision would rend it in twain, and thoughtful Free Churchmen recognize this situation with sympathy and understanding. But by the logic of events the Church of England may be driven to face basic issues, and ultimately, in conformity with its desire for intercommunion and reunion, it cannot refuse to do so.

In his Cambridge sermon Dr. Fisher referred to a distinguished theologian who had suggested that schemes of reunion should be postponed until further study and prayer in all Christian communions had led them to a recovered apprehension of the integrity and balance of Christian truth. The past, Dr. Fisher said, does not suggest that such theological unanimity will come in any foreseeable future. Perhaps we may justly despair of the theologians; but suppose, instead of theologians, the Archbishop had considered New Testament scholars? It may safely be affirmed that the great majority of New Testament scholars, outside the Church of Rome, would agree that Apostolic Succession has no justification in the teaching of Scripture. This fact is highly significant, and it cannot be evaded or ignored in future discussions. No one would dream of asking the Church of England to abandon episcopacy, since it is consecrated in their system of Church order by centuries of use; but equally the Free Churches cannot be asked to try out episcopacy if it is tied to functions based upon Apostolic Succession. The basic issue is whether, or not, Free Church ministers exercise a valid ministry in the Church of God. To-day, as I have said, the Church of England could not answer this question, except by the loss of that 'substantial minority' which hesitates to enter into full communion even with the Church of South India. But what of to-morrow and the day after? It is hard to think that, unless she accepts the views of the minority, she can permanently resign herself to an attitude determined by expediency and self-preservation.

Meantime, Free Churchmen can aid further discussions by thinking out, and stating more fully, their convictions regarding the Christian ministry. Already they possess Apostolic Succession in the truer sense of that term. They continue steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers. They affirm the fundamental truth of the Scriptures, are faithful to the implications of the Nicene Creed, and reverently esteem and maintain the Christian sacraments. Their ministers stand in lineal succession to those who have exercised the ministerial office since the days of the Apostles and, in their measure, they continue the Essential Ministry of Christ Himself. They cannot, it is true, trace their succession by an unbroken chain of external authorization, as indeed no one can; but they believe that a Christian minister must have the call of the Holy Spirit and the ratification of the Church through ordination. If this ratification is imperfect, so is all ratification in a disunited Church. But the authorization is far more organic than has commonly been supposed. The separated communions are not broken fragments of the Church Catholic, comparable to the disconnected

parts of a crushed wafer; they are severed organic fragments in which the life of the Body still flows, and in which in His mercy the Holy Spirit is still pleased to dwell. For this reason their ordinations are not authorizations for ministry only in a particular community, but for service to the whole Church of Christ. It may be doubted if they would fail to recognize that further authorization is needed, if there is to be a closer drawing together and a healing of the sundered parts of the Body of Christ; nor is it clear that they would refuse a form of episcopal ordination, as representing the whole Church, provided it were mediated by bishops *and presbyters* acting in consort. There is no need to insist on one organization. Let each communion fulfil its own life, so long as God leaves His candlestick in its midst; but let each recognize the churchmanship of all. The day this happens intercommunion will be inevitable, and we shall have the Church of God living in unity, with diversity of gifts and ministrations, each communion sharing in the life of the whole. This relationship is not federation, but integration; a unity which mirrors that of the Blessed Trinity itself, and in which the high priestly prayer of Christ is fulfilled.

The Baptism of Our Lord

By the Reverend F. E. Lownds, B.A., St. Paul's Vicarage, Ealing, London

Any study in our Lord's baptism must seek an answer to three questions.

(1) What took place on the banks of the Jordan?

(2) What led our Lord to go there?

(3) What did it mean to our Lord?

(1) What took place on the banks of the Jordan? The difficulty in answering this question lies in the fact that in St. Matthew's account the words employed are 'This is my beloved Son,' while St. Mark and St. Luke use the words 'Thou art my beloved Son.' The former is addressed to a third person or persons; the latter to our Lord Himself. The former makes it a public occasion for the benefit of the people; the latter personal for the sake of Jesus Himself. We are left with another account in St. John 1^{32-34}, which appears to be John the Baptist's own personal account of the events. In this no reference is made to the Voice at all. He identifies Jesus as the promised Messiah by the fact that a dove comes to rest upon Him at the moment of His baptism. Now that sign could hardly have been required if there had been a voice audible to John. If even John the Baptist did not hear the Voice it must have been in the inner consciousness of Jesus only. Its intention must have been personal to Him alone, and the record of it ultimately traceable to Him also.

That this was indeed the case is confirmed not only by the natural preference we should give in such case to St. Mark's account but also by our Lord's obvious reticence as to His Messiahship. (Wilt Thou not tell us whether Thou be the Messiah or no?) This is inexplicable if there had been a public declaration of that fact by a Voice from heaven at the commencement of His ministry.

St. Luke speaks of the baptism taking place when all the people were baptised. This seems to suggest what otherwise appears appropriate—that our Lord's own baptism took place at the close of a busy day. The people had dispersed and John was alone. It was then that Jesus came to him and sought baptism. During the course of that transaction a dove quietly descended on Him. Then John knew. But that was all there was to be seen, unless we are to take into account the attitude of those two as they stood side by side in the water. But that is another story.

(2) What then led our Lord to go to John's baptism? If what has been written is correct all explanations which would make it an example to the people are obviously ruled out. They knew nothing about it and could not therefore be directly influenced by it. His own reasons must have been personal. But though His motives were personal they were not selfish.

Now it is obvious from one glimpse we have of Him in His boyhood days that even at that early age He was strangely conscious of a sense of mission. 'He must be about His Father's business.' This must have been one factor; another the impression which John the Baptist made upon Him. 'Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John' is no cold formal tribute. It springs from impassioned admiration. Again the fact that our Lord's earliest teaching was identical with John's (Mt 4^{17}, Mk 1^{15}) shows how our Lord was impressed by John's message. It does not seem too much to say that Jesus felt John's ministry to be the call of God to His own mission. To this He willed to dedicate His life in the act of baptism.

After His baptism we are told that He was led of the Spirit into the wilderness. This implies at any rate that the journey into the wilderness was not part of His original plan. He had not then foreseen what did actually take place at His baptism. But He surely must have had some plan in His mind. Since the acceptance of John's baptism would seem to involve membership in John's company, the becoming one of John's disciples would seem to have been His intention.

Nevertheless the fact that our Lord had the experience He did in the Jordan implies preparedness on the part of our Lord. The fact that He was there commissioned implies also that therein He was placing Himself at God's disposal, which in turn implies an element of sacrifice, a breaking of ties which were not to be lightly sundered. What were those ties? They were not sinful. But they were liable to hold Him back. And they were strong. What were they? Two suggest themselves. One was the hold which His own home life had upon Him. In spite of its limitations, and in spite of the unfriendliness which He obviously had to face from other members of the family, He dearly loved the life at Nazareth. And there are other indications that He by no means welcomed the publicity that a public career would entail. The other, the human reluctance to break away from the known to the unknown; of the swimmer to take his feet off the ground; of the human to commit himself unreservedly to God. It was the costly sundering of these ties which made Him ready to receive the new revelation awaiting Him.

(3) What significance had His baptism for our Lord? In other words what was the import to Him of the words 'Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased'? Clearly these words, spoken as they were in His own inner consciousness, must have conveyed to Him some truth that was new to Him. In fact it caused Him, as we have seen, to alter His plans. It must have been something more than a word of encouragement. It cannot have been a mere statement that He was God's Son, for at the age of twelve He was already speaking of God as His Father, and this involves, as He must have seen, the corresponding truth that He was God's Son.

Now these words are quotations from the Psalms. 'Thou art my Son' occurs in the second Psalm. This Psalm was recognized in our Lord's day as Messianic. In other words, this was the revelation to Him that the Son was also Messiah. That this Psalm was in our Lord's mind appears also in the Temptation, for in this Psalm the Son is given the heathen for His inheritance. And this is the basis for the Temptation on the exceeding high mountain when all the kingdoms of the world were shown to Him. If He were the Son referred to in Ps 2, then all the kingdoms of the world were His by right.

Once we recognize what the revelation was which He received at His baptism it is easy to understand why He needed to go away alone to think it out. It is easy to understand His deep preoccupation—so deep that no thought even of food came to Him; clear, too, that until He had fully assimilated this truth He would be peculiarly liable to temptation.

Furthermore, the Spirit is given Him as the essential provision for carrying out His mission as Messiah. Is it possible to see any expression of that gift in more than general terms? Is it not conceivable that He was thereby endowed with that supernatural power which characterized His work? We are told specifically that the changing of the water into wine was the first miracle. He had not then so far used such power.

Behind each of the temptations, moreover, there is a strong sense of untried power. Surely something must have occurred to bring this sense out. It seems very natural to connect it with the giving of the Spirit at His baptism.

Lastly there is a clear note of approval given to Jesus. Those thirty years have been not only a time of preparation but also a proving. His Messiahship is an office to which He is appointed, but it is also the reward of what He is. He is Messiah not only by right of birth but by right of moral and spiritual achievement.

If, then, the conclusions reached above are valid, our Lord's baptism should be the norm of our own understanding of baptism. The heart of it from the human standpoint is an act of dedication. This dedication involves an act of surrender. That He had no sin to surrender as we have does not make His baptism unlike our own, or in any way alter the fact that for us there has to be remission of sin. There is no effective surrender to God which is not also a letting go and being released from sin. On the Godward side it brings the fuller understanding of our relationship with God and the service that flows from it. There is the equipment given corresponding to the task involved. There is the admission into the Kingdom of Heaven. Doubtless the events of our Lord's death and resurrection and the formation of the Christian Church widen the scope of baptism. But those are only developments of factors which are already present in our Lord's own baptism. In this, as in all else, He is our example, and discipleship is not inadequately described in the challenge 'Follow Me.'

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

The Other Mile

By the Reverend Edwin H. Barnes,
East Ham, London

'And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.'—Mt 5^{41}

When Jesus lived in Palestine that country, as you know, had been conquered by the Romans, who kept an army of occupation in the land. Naturally the Jews did not like this at all, in fact most of them heartily detested Rome and her soldiers who had taken away their freedom. They often wondered how they could throw off the hated yoke, and sometimes a number of them would make a plot to do so. Then the Romans would put down the plot—perhaps with a good deal of bloodshed, and this would make them more hated than ever. Now one of the rules that the Romans had made was that any of her soldiers could compel a Jew to go with him a certain distance, and carry his pack. He might be made to go only that certain distance, and no more, but this was often inconvenient: it took the Jew away from whatever it was that he happened to be doing, and it was hard work too because the soldier's pack would probably be very heavy. More than anything, the Jew found it very distasteful to have to go to this trouble and inconvenience for the sake of one of the hated Romans. Now it may have been of this very objectionable task that our Lord was thinking when He spoke the words of our text. What is more, some people think that Jesus meant that if a man were compelled to go a mile he should go not only two, but *two more*, that is *three* altogether, so you see the Jews found this a very hard lesson.

Of course Jesus was thinking not only of Jews who had to carry burdens for Roman soldiers. What He was really pointing out was that if we have to perform some service for someone else, we ought to do that—and a little more than is strictly necessary. Though we may not be compelled, we may have the opportunity to help someone, and then we should do what might reasonably be expected of us—and something more.

We often speak of that kind of action—of doing the little extra—as 'going the other mile.' Let me try to show you what I mean. Some time ago I was motoring in a strange town, and I wanted to visit a friend who lived in a certain road. Several people had been unable to tell me where it was, but at last I saw a man who, I thought, would be sure to know. This man was wearing a khaki uniform and riding a motor-cycle which, with its sidecar, was painted a bright yellow. When I stopped him and asked for his assistance, he at once said, 'Yes, I know it, sir, it's about a mile from here. If you'll follow me I'll show you where it is.' So he turned his machine round and rode off in front of me, looking back occasionally to make sure that I was following, and in a short time he led me into the road I wanted to find. Now it was this man's duty to help me because he was one of those very useful people, an A.A. patrol. He might have performed his *duty* by telling me where the road was and leaving me to find it as best I could. But he went the other mile—he really did—on his motor-cycle, and I was very grateful to him.

I remember one occasion when I had to travel a long distance by train. It was during the War, and there were no restaurant cars. When we stopped at a station an old lady asked a porter if she could obtain a cup of tea. Although he told her she could get one from the refreshment room on the same platform the old lady was a little nervous about leaving the train in case it should go without her. So the porter went off, and soon brought a cup of tea to the compartment. He 'went the other mile' just as truly as the A.A. man had done, although it certainly was not a mile to the refreshment room!

On another journey the guard had just waved his flag for the train to go on when a man rushed on to the platform. The fireman was leaning from the cab of the engine, but I noticed that he paused until the man had entered a compartment, then he passed on the guard's signal to the driver, and the train started. Of course it is rather dangerous, especially for boys and girls, to try to board a train at the last minute like that—the fireman might not be so observant or so considerate. But this one was. He too 'went the other mile,' just as did the porter and the A.A. patrol, though he did not even leave the place where he was standing.

So remember, boys and girls, there are many ways in which we can obey this commandment of our Lord, 'And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.'

The Census

By the Reverend V. J. Abernethy, B.D.,
West Hartlepool

'And all went to be taxed, every one into his own city.'—Lk 2^{3}.

There was a buff-coloured form lying in your home a few weeks ago which was supposed to be

filled in by the head of the household. The form was to show who was living in your home on Sunday midnight, April 8. It was what we call a Census Form. From time to time the Government of this country take a census or a count of the people residing here, and what they are doing. The last Census was taken twenty years ago, so I suppose the Government thought it was about time we had another.

The head of the house was required to give a number of details of those residing in his home at midnight—such as Christian names, Surnames, Male or Female, Age, Birthplace, Nationality, Occupation (whether still at school), and so on. But one instruction particularly interested me. It was that if there was a baby in the household who had not yet been given a name, then the head of the house was to write 'Baby' for the Christian name. On the back of the form examples were given of how to fill it in. There was a Katherine Brown, a William Brown, a John Brown, and a 'Baby' Brown. Evidently 'Baby' Brown was a new arrival in the home!

I could not help wondering whether, in such a situation, Mrs. Brown would write 'Baby' Brown or the name she intended to give her child. It reminded me of the story of the Census Officer who called upon the housewife and asked for the number of children in her home. 'Well, there is Emily and 'Orace and Jack,' she commenced. 'Oh, don't give me names,' said the Officer impatiently, 'the number will do.' 'Number, indeed,' flashed back the housewife, 'we haven't exhausted names yet!'

That story is amusing, but it points out the dangers of a Census. It is that it seems to treat us as a number or a unit. The Census seems to docket and tabulate us. The Census Officer or whoever examines the forms is not interested in us as individuals. We are simply another member of the population.

But something within us protests at that treatment. William Brown may be just a number to the Census Officer, but to his mother and father he is a person of considerable importance. And who knows, some day he may become a Prime Minister or a famous writer or star cricketer? He is more than a name or a number.

Have you ever thought that the name of Jesus may have appeared on a Census Paper? His father and mother left Nazareth for Bethlehem because a Census was taking place, and the citizens had to be enrolled in their birthplace. It was while Mary and Joseph were in Bethlehem that Jesus was born. And if Joseph filled in his form after the birth of Jesus, I wonder whether he wrote 'Baby Ben Joseph' or 'Jesus Ben Joseph?' I don't know, but I am quite sure the Census Officer would treat the insertion very casually, for the pagan world held children in far less esteem than Christians do. And yet—if he had only known! That name and number that would mean so little to him was to represent the Saviour of the world! If we were to discover those old Census Returns among the recovered papers of the ancient world, we would delve among them—not to count the number of people that were in existence in Palestine at that time, but to see if we could trace a reference to the Babe of Bethlehem. And we would do that because Jesus has meant so much to us.

So let us remember that persons are of more importance than Census Forms—however necessary they may be—and that by His Death for men and women, boys and girls, Jesus has put the seal on human worth.

The Christian Year

Sixth Sunday after Trinity

The Lamp on the Stand

By the Reverend John L. Riach, B.D., Edinburgh

'Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.'—Mt $5^{15.\ 16}$.

'And he said unto them, Is a candle brought to be put under a bushel, or under a bed? and not to be set on a candlestick? For there is nothing hid, which shall not be manifested; neither was any thing kept secret, but that it should come abroad.'—Mk $4^{21.\ 22}$.

'No man, when he hath lighted a candle, putteth it in a secret place, neither under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that they which come in may see the light. And when the people were gathered thick together, he began to say, This is an evil generation: they seek a sign; and there shall no sign be given it, but the sign of Jonas the prophet.'—Lk $11^{33.\ 29}$.

It was said of Martin Luther, that when he chatted with his friends over the supper table on the deep things of Christianity, he did not hesitate to illustrate his points with some homely parable about his children, or servants, or garden. This was the way of Jesus. His parables are the homeliest of stories drawn from the every-day life of men, so that a full picture of Galilee in His time may be reconstructed from His parables alone. The custom of Eastern folk at the quick descent of darkness can be gathered from this parable of the lamp on the stand, told by all three Evangelists. In their account of the parable Matthew and Mark have in mind the one-roomed cottage of the Galilean peasant. When the mirk

is thick, the woman of the house lights an Eastern oil lamp, then does not proceed to place it under an upturned meal tub, but sets it on a lamp stand where its rays will penetrate to every corner of the humble home. Luke, being a Greek, visualizes a large villa belonging to a lordly Roman. At nightfall a slave lights an oil lamp, and does not then put it in the cellar where it will be useless, but sets it in a niche of the spacious hall where it will give light to any who enter the master's domain. Writing as they did some forty years after Jesus' death, the Evangelists found themselves with this parable of their Lord on their hands but with no clue to the exact interpretation He would have them put upon it. Thus, we discover that each Gospel writer interprets it in an entirely different way.

1. When we turn to Matthew, and find that, having told the parable, he adds the words, 'Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father . . . ,' he obviously interprets the parable to mean that the actions of us Christians should be outstandingly good, because men insist on judging God by the acts of those who profess to believe in Him. Many Christian folk to-day when challenged about their faith, or when they hear it derided, have nothing to say in its defence. They are curiously tongue-tied in this regard, whatever the causes be. This, however, does not perturb them unduly, because in their view what in the last resort refutes any challenge to Christianity is not anything we say, but what we do. Now, it is beyond dispute that men can be converted to the Christian faith by a Christian doing an outstandingly fine thing. While that is true, if we imagine that good acts are more potent to rouse faith in men than good words we are wrong. Look at the emphasis given to preaching in the New Testament, as when Paul maintains that it is by the foolishness of preaching men are made to believe. Examine the striking conversions Jesus had to His credit—Nicodemus, Zacchaeus, Matthew—and the discovery is made that they were wrought, not by His bonny acts, but by something He said. Regard any outstanding reformer like John Knox, or evangelist like Moody, and it stands for all to see that it was no deeds of theirs, but inspired words which led myriads to faith. Why our actions should be notably good is not because they are more potent to convert and save men than all the fifty thousand sermons preached every Sunday in Britain, but because unbelieving men will insist on judging God not by what He is, but by what we, who profess belief in Him, do. Let us do anything unjust, mean, or evil, and it would not be so bad if the world thought we, as individuals, were blackguards; but the tragedy is that men's eyes travel beyond us to God, and deem Him unworthy, since that is all He can apparently make out of us. This is why, points out Matthew, our actions should be so conspicuously good that they catch the eye like a lamp in a peasant's cottage. Enter by the door out of the darkness, and the first thing that draws a stranger's eye is the brightest thing in the room, the lamp flame. The goodness of our actions must be as outstanding as the lamp's light, not because acts are more potent than words to make men believe, but because men will, alas, judge God not by what He really is, but by what they see us, who profess belief in Him, do.

2. Second, when we look at Mark's account of the parable, and find him following it up with the words, 'there is nothing hid, which shall not be manifested,' we discover his interpretation of the parable is that men's understanding of Christianity becomes clearer with the passing of time. The confusion which reigns among men as to what Christianity is in its essence has now reached alarming dimensions. The irony is that, if they chose, men could be better informed to-day in the gospel than any generation that has yet lived. By scientific Biblical criticism, devoted scholars can put into our hands more knowledge of the Old Testament's construction and interpretation, and deeper insight into the teaching of Christ, and the theology of Paul, than any generation of Christians have yet possessed. This is only what Jesus promised would transpire. When He spoke about things He said and did whose significance was not understood by men of His own time, but would be grasped by men of a later day; when He pointed to a scribe bringing treasures new and old out of the Scripture; when He promised His followers that the Holy Spirit would guide them into all truth, what do such assertions mean except that the further we move away from the days of the New Testament the deeper can our insight into Christianity be? This is the meaning Mark, at any rate, takes out of Jesus' parable of the lamp on the stand. Here is a visitor sitting in a Galilean cottage. The woman of the house, being poor, waits until it is quite dark before lighting the lamp and setting it on its stand. When its flame illumines the room the stranger's eye is dazzled for a moment or two. Then he begins to pick out different objects in the dwelling, and, as his vision becomes more accustomed to the light, he notices other things which he did not perceive before. That is how it stands with Christianity. Things in the gospel hidden in Jesus' day can be made manifest in ours. The understanding of the Christian faith can become deeper and fuller in time if men have the will to learn. This is what makes the fogginess about Christianity on part of the men in our day so inexcusable.

3. Third, when Luke prefixes this parable of the lamp on the stand with the words, 'This is an evil generation: they seek a sign,' we find he interprets it to mean that the truth of Christianity can be seen only by its own light. Events, grim and terrifying, are compelling men to take Christianity seriously with its conceptions of judgment, grace, and righteousness exalting a nation. No longer can men dismiss this faith with a smile, despite all the clever arguments levelled against it by the intellectuals. Yet, one vital doubt prevents men embracing Christianity wholeheartedly, and that is the question, 'Is it true?' Well, is it? The pathetic thing is that men are seeking to prove the truth or falsity of Christianity by something outside itself. They are turning to psychology to see if this new science can really prove if the Christian concept of God is projection of the mind, or reality. They are consulting philosophy to ascertain if by some superhuman effort on its part it cannot prove, through sheer reasoning, that God's existence is more than a mere possibility. They are appealing to the physicists to inquire if there really is any room in a world of natural law for a God of providence who controls the events of history as Christianity teaches. They are no different from the Jews of Jesus' own day who wished Him to prove His divinity by something entirely outside Himself. Let Him do some marvellous physical feat like making the sun stand still, or hurling Himself down from the Temple roof to land unharmed on the ground and they would believe in Him. It is all so pitiful. Christianity cannot be proved by anything outside itself. Its truth is conclusively seen only by the light which it itself supplies. Keep Christianity at arm's length and try thus to prove its veracity, and we only fail. Risk having faith, and the truth of Christianity comes flashing to the mind with irresistible conviction, which the New Testament explains as the witness of the Holy Spirit within us. What is that, pray, but Christianity's truth being seen in nothing but its own light? Such is Luke's interpretation of this parable. When a lamp is lit and placed in the hall of a Roman villa, any one entering can see every object in that hall including the lamp itself. While each article is seen only by the light which is shed from the lamp, it is different with the lamp. It is not observed by light from any other object, but only by the light which it itself provides. Men are seeking a sign from this branch of learning, or that, to ascertain if Christianity is true before they will embrace the one thing which can save the world. When will they learn that the truth of Christianity, like the lamp on the stand, can be seen only by its own light?

If Jesus meant each parable to have only one meaning, which of these three interpretations of this parable is true? None can tell. But, does it really matter, when each interpretation gives the world a truth which it can ignore only at its dire peril?

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

His Hands

BY THE REVEREND JOHN R. GRAY, B.D., GLASGOW

'He laid his hands on every one of them, and healed them.'—Lk 4^{40}.

'He shewed unto them his hands.'—Jn 20^{20}.

'He lifted up his hands, and blessed them.'—Lk 24^{50}.

Those who have seen Albert Durer's famous picture *Praying Hands* can never thereafter think of hands as unimportant. The point of the painting, of course, is that the hands are not lily-white, but scarred, stained, and gnarled—the hands of one who has worked and suffered. Reflection will confirm Durer's suggestion of the vast significance of hands. Quite often they indicate a man's calling or occupation. There are the large and sinewy hands of the blacksmith; the tapering, sensitive fingers of the artist; the thickened and muscular, and wonderfully skilful hands of the fisherman; the strong, but gentle, hands of the surgeon; the work-worn, rough, beloved hands of the mother. What a picture is conjured by the description 'Deft and sure, there was no hurry in her hands!'

Faces deceive almost as often as they reveal, but not hands. Watch that calm and placid face! Only the hands clasping and unclasping or tightly clenched show the inner conflict, the unquiet mind, the carefully controlled anger. How cruel hands can be, and how kind; how grasping and greedy; how friendly and generous!

How wonderful our Lord's hands must have been! They were not clean and soft like a preacher's, but useful looking and yet gentle too. They must have been skilled hands that could wield a chisel or an axe and reef a sail, or help to haul a net in time of need. They were not too fine to touch leprous sores and fevered brows, and eyes with the frightful, repulsive crusts so often seen in the East. In the Gospel of Luke we read that 'they that had any sick with divers diseases brought them unto him; and he laid his hands on every one of them, and healed them.'

In the days to come, if our hands are reluctant to turn to the necessary, humble tasks of life—

to washing or writing, to cleaning or healing, cooking or serving, let us look at them and remember those other hands. They did not rebel at the routine tasks of the carpenter's shop, nor shrink from the most loathsome contacts, and even at the end were found washing the disciples' feet. 'He laid his hands on every one of them, and healed them.'

2. But there was one disease so virulent and deep-seated that even Christ's hands could not heal it, one hurt so fearful it could only be cured by His own suffering. Disease of the body fled before Him, but the disease of the human heart, sin, seems only to have grown more malignant. Resistant to the pathos of the Last Supper and the agony of the Garden, men seemed unmoved at the majestic compassion of the Cross. Still unhealed, they looked on, and when the first news came of His rising, there were some even of His disciples sceptical and suspicious. So He made the supreme appeal which St. John records. The disciples were huddled together behind closed doors for fear. To them came Christ. 'Peace be unto you,' He said. 'And when he had so said, he shewed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord';—glad, for here was proof of the love of God and proof of the power of God—the nailprints in the hands of the Risen Son of God.

If, when we feel that our lot is hard and our sufferings greater than we deserve; if, when our hands clench in selfish rebellion, or clasp in desperate anxiety, we could visualize two hands in which are nailprints, our querulous complaining would melt into wondering gratitude and adoring praise. 'He shewed unto them his hands.'

3. When finally Christ left the disciples to face the immense task of spreading His gospel to the uttermost parts of the earth; left them with so many questions still unanswered, with only the promise of persecution and an almost certain martyrdom, the last they saw of Him was with His hands uplifted in blessing. St. Luke tells us in the last few verses of his Gospel that 'Christ led His disciples out towards Bethany, and He lifted up His hands and blessed them.'

So, if at times the burden of our work for the gospel seems too heavy, or our frustration too grievous; if at times the Kingdom seems to be coming so slowly as hardly to be said to be coming at all; if we feel the need for greater certainty, more assurance than we have, then surely the Lord, if we ask Him, will lead us out towards the peace of some Bethany, and lifting up His hands, will bless us too, and there will be peace in our souls again and power in our lives, and a deathless hope in our hearts.

'He laid his hands on every one of them, and healed them.' 'He shewed unto them his hands.' 'He lifted up his hands and blessed them.'

And those hands so quick to heal, so ready to suffer, so sure to bless, are the hands into which we may surely commit ourselves and our dear ones, certain that they are still the same, and always will be. If, in helplessness or fierce temptation, in heart-break or weariness or despair, we lift our hands in prayer, quite surely they will be met and held by His.

And when at length, with darkened eyes and fingers cold, we seek some last, loved hand to hold—ready, eager to help and comfort and receive us on the other side will be—His hands.

EIGHTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Religion—Bane or Blessing

BY THE REVEREND H. G. NEWSHAM, M.A., EDINBURGH

'Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven.'—Mt 7^{21}.

When Joan of Arc came to Chinon to get the Dauphin's blessing upon her projected crusade, her youthful idealism and her manifest sincerity (according to Bernard Shaw) profoundly moved and disturbed the Archbishop of Rheims. 'Child,' he said, 'you are in love with religion.' 'Am I,' replied Joan, somewhat startled. 'I never thought of that. Is there any harm in it?' 'There is no harm in it, my child. But there is danger.' Whereupon Joan rose to her feet with joy irradiating her face. 'There is always danger,' she cried, 'except in heaven.'

'There is no harm in it; but . . . there is danger.' The Archbishop was thinking, no doubt, of one particular kind of danger; that in which Joan would stand should her conscience bring her into collision with the conservatism, the entrenched interests, the musty law-book minds of Church and State. He saw the shadow of the stake behind this eager maid.

There is, however, another kind of danger which it is just conceivable the Archbishop believed Joan might stand in; a deadlier one even than the physical. If so, the irony is that it was the Archbishop's own most grievous peril. It is ours too.

The danger I have in mind is that of bad religion. The danger of the powerful religious impulse becoming harnessed to less than truly God-inspired ends. All history testifies that the religious impulse is one of the most powerful elements in our human make-up. And precisely because it is so powerful and imperious it can work

great mischief should it become directed, as so often it has, towards low and even sinister objectives.

Lord Balfour once warned us of the fatal ease with which we make our minds the accomplices and not the controllers of our passions. The intellect is a powerful instrument; one of the marks of man's status and stature. But if it becomes the servant of our selfishness, the tool of our lusts, the cunning of our flesh—then its very power can degrade us lower than the beasts. It is somewhat so with religion. It is a God-given impulse, breathed into man with the breath of life, capable of lifting us to the heaven of heavens. But, because of its strength, like every other dynamic thing, if captured by an enemy it can be turned to our destruction.

To say of any man that he is deeply religious is to say little or nothing. Everything turns upon the kind of religion of which he is so fervent a practitioner. There is no denying that great evils, perhaps the greatest evils ever done by men, have been done in the name of religion, and done sincerely. Yet there is equally no denying that the greatest good ever done, or ever envisaged, by men has also been inspired by, and could never have been inspired otherwise than by, religion. That is the danger. The enormous strength of the religious impulse for good or for ill.

Was something of this in the Archbishop's mind when he looked with such troubled concern on the radiant Joan? Might she not confuse her prejudices with her voices, and make religion the accomplice of her pride and her self-will? Might she not mistake purely political and patriotic enthusiasms for the absolute will of God?

But if that were her danger, what of the Archbishop? Was he in no danger of making religion the accomplice of the political, the financial and the social status quo? Was he in no danger of invoking all the awesome authority of the sacred and the Divine to prevent even criticism, still more change and reform, from troubling the Institution of which he was a pillar; and the proud office which he with such grandeur sustained? How far was the powerful sanction of religion being employed as the ally of traditionalism, the love of power, the fear of change, and many another all too human and worldly weakness?

'There is no harm in it, my child, but there is danger.' 'Sir,' we must reply, 'there can be harm in it, too, as well as danger.' Was it not in the name of religion witches were burned? Was it not in the name of religion Joan herself was martyred? Was it not in the name of religion Saul of Tarsus sought the extermination of Christians with fanatical zeal? Was it not religion, and religion of a lofty kind, that denounced Jesus of Nazareth as a blasphemer and contrived His execution on the Cross?

And yet . . . was it not religion which was the master-passion of that same Jesus' life? Was it not the religion He inspired, and of which He is the living soul, which again and again has burst through the institutional crusts and shells imprisoning and stifling it? Has it not been religion inspired by Christ which has challenged deep-seated wrongs and evils; pioneering everywhere the attack upon disease; upon illiteracy and ignorance; upon cruel systems of caste and racial supremacy; upon the subjection of womanhood —bringing to the birth, in fact, an order of Christian chivalry whose lives and works are outstanding in the constructive and beneficent personalities and deeds of history?

You see the paradox, the deadly danger. Religion so powerful that it can be man's greatest inspiration or his greatest perversion. It can animate the crucifiers. It can inspire the crucified.

It is highly significant that the Bible does not say religion's greatest danger is irreligion or atheism or godless materialism, as we might be tempted to say to-day. The Bible says religion's greatest danger is bad religion, narrow and bigoted religion, wrong-headed and hard-hearted religion, conventional and fossilized religion.

True, when the Scriptures were written, atheistic secularism was practically non-existent. It is, broadly speaking, only since the Renaissance that any serious denial of a religious interpretation of life has become widespread. But, even so, there are considerations which should make us give closest heed to the Scriptural warning.

First, because atheism, in part at least, is a justifiable recoil from the uglier aspects of bad religion. It is impossible to doubt that the Bolshevik repudiation of religion was due in no small measure to certain serious deficiencies, if not indeed distortions, in the Orthodox Church. Roman Catholicism, also, must carry a heavy responsibility for disbelief, and anti-clericalism in lands where it has the power to claim that the Vatican and Christ are not to be distinguished. But Protestantism, too, and in our own land, is also guilty, especially when it equates some Mosaic Sabbatarianism with the Will of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Religion of this kind has a heavy responsibility, for which one day its misguided zealots will have to answer, for throwing intelligent and earnest people into the camp of the unbeliever. Hence the Biblical concern for religion, pure and undefiled by the traditions of men, is urgently relevant to-day.

A second reason why this concern is not out-of-date in our different religious climate is this—

atheism does not, after all, escape religion. What it actually does is to relapse into idolatries, with cults, and pageantry, and sacred scriptures—*Das Kapital* or *Mein Kampf*, for instance—far more powerful than the Odins, or Baals, or Dianas of the past. Unbelief is never unbelief. It is still Belief. It is still Faith. Faith in man with a capital M. Or in science with a capital S. Or in some inevitability inherent in history, substituting Marx for Muhammad as the prophet of Allah. Or faith in some Golden Age which is coming as soon as one or two obstacles are violently removed. Contemporary history cries aloud that man can never be a mere disbeliever. He is a tremendous believer. He must have a Faith to live for; and even to die for.

Therefore, the quality of that Faith, the truth of that Faith, is of supreme importance. The struggle still is, as on Carmel, between the God of Righteousness and the Baals of the Nature and fertility cults, and as on Calvary between the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and the nationalistic, legalistic God of Caiaphas, a struggle between high religion and low, between good religion and bad, between religion according to the spirit of Christ and all inferior forms.

'Many will say to Me Lord, Lord. And I will say Depart from Me: I never knew you.' Those trenchant words sound across the centuries. Jesus foresaw the misuse, the abuse even, of His own name. He foresaw that many an individual and institution would be called Christian, and believe itself Christian; yet He would indignantly disown it. There would be bad, distorted Christianity, a contradiction of His mind and purpose as sharp as any offered by blasphemers or outright opponents. All Christians and all churches must ever remember that they stand under the judgment of that ever-living Word, which is sharper than a two-edged sword.

The Christian who says, 'Lord, Lord,' but confines his Christian interest to his own neighbourhood, class or country, is in reality a contradiction in terms.

The Christian who says, 'Lord, Lord,' but is unaware of the depth of his personal need for forgiveness, for a larger love, a wiser humility, a more selfless life, is in reality a contradiction in terms.

The Christian who says, 'Lord, Lord,' but who rarely if ever seeks light and guidance from his Lord in the secret place, is in reality a contradiction in terms.

The Christian who says, 'Lord, Lord,' but whose religion is essentially a lukewarm conventional, once-a-week-at-most affair, is in reality a contradiction in terms.

The Christian who says, 'Lord, Lord,' but seldom gazes intently upon the portrait of his Lord bequeathed in the Gospels, and seldom compares and contrasts his own way of life and outlook with his Lord's, is in reality a contradiction in terms.

Religion's greatest danger? Shoddy, inferior, utility religion. Christianity's greatest danger? Poor, insincere, or sincerely mistaken and off-centre Christianity. The world's greatest need? The real thing. The simplicity, the selfless good will, the all-embracing love of Christ-inspired and Christ-governed lives, emancipated from the bondage of much that so many Churchmen sincerely, but terribly mistakenly, still imagine to matter.

But we can all think—it is one of religion's incessant dangers—of religious people whose religion is manifestly faulty compared with our own. The momentous matter is the beam in our own eye. The Word of Christ is to us, lest we be among those who are saying, 'Lord, Lord,' but whom, sorrowfully, He disowns.

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Greatness Qualified

BY THE REVEREND J. C. MORTON, SHEFFIELD

'Naaman . . . was a great man . . . but.'—2 K 5^1.

There is an old saying, somewhat hackneyed in its use by people unaccustomed to public speaking, 'some are born great, some achieve greatness, and some have greatness thrust upon them.' The implication being that a measure of greatness is possible for all. But whether we are born great, achieve it, or have it thrust upon us our greatness is never complete. It is always a qualified greatness. Of the best it can rightly be said, He was great, but! And that 'but' is tremendously important.

Without exception we can pass the same judgment on all the great figures of history. Paul and Luther, Bismarck and Napoleon, Lenin and —Hitler? (Do we stand too near him to pass judgment, or is it that the title can never be ascribed to him? We shall see.) All were great, but. History produces only one exception to this rule, the Man of Nazareth. To Him the 'but' does not apply; it has no meaning. It is an anachronism, for you cannot qualify perfection. He is the exception and there is no other. And to recognize this is important as ultimately we shall see. Meanwhile the only greatness we can know is a qualified greatness.

Look at the story from which the words of the text are taken. Naaman, captain of the host of the king of Syria, was a great man with his master.

By him the Lord had given deliverance to Syria. He was a mighty man in valour, skilful in battle and utterly courageous. The story adds one word which puts the keystone on this man's greatness. He was honourable. Naaman was a great man, but! And look what follows the but; he was a leper. His greatness was shadowed by tragedy. At the centre of his life was that which would render him outcast. The very people who now honoured him would turn away with loathing and disgust. Naaman was great, but! And what tragedy is contained in that word.

It is not difficult to see the implication of this truth on a wider scale, with this important difference that while Naaman was not responsible for the malady which qualified his greatness we can be and often are responsible for that which qualifies ours. Let us take one or two examples.

If our civilization should survive, a fact about which we cannot be entirely optimistic, I can imagine a historian of the future writing of the people of to-day in the following way: 'Twentieth-century civilization touched the peak of greatness. Never in the history of the world were so many advances made and in such varied fields of activity. They obtained a scientific mastery over Nature never before known. They secured for themselves all the infinite possibilities of atomic energy. Mechanical invention proceeded on so vast a scale that there was no part of the world that could not be visited in the shortest possible time. Verbal communication and entertainment together with vision through space brought a touch of magic that added to the thrill and excitement of life. Their standard of living was the highest experienced and known; and the span of life itself was immeasurably extended. All this is to the credit of twentieth-century civilization. They were a great people, but!' And the historian looking back upon us would be compelled to insert that qualifying word. He would be compelled to say: 'They were a great people but they cared more for comfort than for character; they were a great people but they blurred moral distinctions; they were a great people but—and God forbid that history should pass this judgment upon us—they lost control of their destiny, and are now nothing more than a tragic memory of what might have been.' And if you think the picture overdrawn it is salutary to remember what Arnold Toynbee has told us, that of the twenty-one civilizations that have existed from the beginning of time only seven remain. The rest are lost in the dust and ashes of antiquity.

Or look at it from a personal point of view, for this principle has an individual application. You may argue, of course, that greatness does not belong to you and therefore you are relieved of responsibility. But it does belong to you in the sense in which I am using the word. For the whole of this argument is based upon greatness of character and not of achievement. For achievement counts for nought if character be not there. It is perhaps true to say that character itself is not enough to constitute greatness but it is equally true that it cannot exist without it, which is the reason why one hesitates to ascribe greatness to the modern Fuehrers. How often do we hear it said of a person: 'He was a great chap, but!' And the but has reference not to some failure of achievement, not to the faults and frailties common to our nature or to those peculiarities of temperament which sometimes make us difficult to live with, but rather to those things which spoil and disfigure or to some hideous blemish that casts a dark shadow over life. And perhaps the biggest blemish of all is not to be aware of the blemish. You see this qualification of greatness on a world scale is always presupposed by the personal element. For it is we who make our civilization what it is. It doesn't exist apart from persons.

Psychologists tell us that one of the peculiarities of mental defectives or retarded persons is that by a form of over-compensation they endeavour to create for themselves an illusion of greatness. So a person of this type may steal a motor car and drive it recklessly at high speed or revert to any type of conduct which produces the same effect. What he cannot be normally he will be by way of illusion. There was an example of this in the newspaper a short time ago. It was headed 'The Alcoholic Illiterate.' A young man of twenty-five was found guilty of serious motoring offences. He was described as being a psychopathic personality, an alcoholic, a social misfit, and was unable to read or write. But, he had a gift for mechanics and was a talented pianist. Notice that here is a reversal of the order previously followed. Here we have not greatness qualified by something lower but the lowest qualified by something better. And the grim irony of the situation was that the something better he did possess was perverted to create an illusion of greatness.

I am not suggesting that our generation is illiterate or psychopathic or suffering from chronic alcoholism. But we ought seriously to ask ourselves where the emphasis lies. Is it not upon the lower rather than the higher? And is there not a danger of our finest gifts and achievements being perverted? Because our moral growth and spiritual development are not keeping pace with our technical achievement we are in danger of being duped by the illusion of greatness we have created for ourselves. The machine may yet master us, get out of control, and pile itself up

on the rocks a total wreck. Twentieth-century civilization was great, but !

But let us return again to the story. If Naaman's greatness was qualified by physical disfigurement at least the disfigurement was not permanent. He was cured of his leprosy. This is true of us. The 'but' can be cancelled out and we as a people and as individuals can at least attain unto relative greatness. There is no need to be permanently disfigured. This involves two things.

First of all an unqualified acceptance of the conditions of cure. For Naaman it meant washing in the river Jordan. For us and our civilization it is nothing less than an acceptance of the Lordship of Jesus Christ. We cannot go on saying: We will not have this Man to reign over us. The simple fact is this Man must reign over us or we perish. His Lordship must begin with us as persons and must then be worked out in the wider ways of life. The implications of this are tremendous and far-reaching. The day has gone when we can split life up into the sacred and the secular. All life is sacred and all our living must be sacramental. This world is God's world and He is active in all its affairs. And you and I can do nothing without relating it to His will, without asking ourselves whether what we do has the Divine sanction and authority. This is what I mean when I talk about the Lordship of Christ. It means that all life should be related to Him. And if you ask why I am bold to make such a claim the answer is that Christ is our only standard of measurement. We know nothing of real greatness apart from Him. And when we accept His Lordship we obtain also the power to become like Him. For He is not merely the end but the means to the end. And no one else can do this for us. That is the first thing.

The second grows out of it. Acceptance of His Lordship creates true character, and greatness whether in a person or as a characteristic of civilization is a question of character before it is anything else. For of what value is the highest technical achievement and scientific discovery if we haven't the character and will to control them ?

Does this remedy commend itself to the modern world ? It doesn't any more than Elisha's remedy commended itself to Naaman. His pride rebelled against the idea of washing in the Jordan when the rivers of Abana and Pharpar were at hand. But it is to the credit of this man that he conquered his pride, washed and became clean, his disfigurement gone. Does this remedy commend itself to you individually ? Or is pride still the barrier to accepting the Lordship of Christ ? Well, remember pride will either break or be broken. Pray God it may be broken ere it breaks. 'Naaman . . . was a great man . . . but.'

Contributions and Comments

Kierkegaard as Major Prophet

Dr. C. Clare Oke argues (The Expository Times, lxii. 61 [Nov., 1950]) against my attributing to Kierkegaard (The Expository Times, lxi. 273 [June, 1950]) 'denunciation of philosophy *as such*,' and quotes against me the passage in *Philosophical Fragments* which describes the Christian as a man who believes against reason, but uses reason to show that he has done so. Surely this serves to illustrate rather than to condemn what I wrote.

I tried to show how unfortunate and inappropriate had been Kierkegaard's way of expressing his disapproval of such rationalizers as Hegel and Schleiermacher, attacking them not for their bad reasoning but for their reasoning about matters of faith at all. There is no need to quote from these diatribes, since the paragraph Dr. Oke cites to confute me contains quite enough for my justification. Did Kierkegaard mean by the Christian's duty to 'believe against reason' only that there are certain religious axioms, unprovable but indubitable (like the 'Law of Sufficient Reason' in Logic, which it is alike impossible for a rational mind to doubt and to prove) ? If he meant no more than this, the phrase 'belief against reason' was surely improper; no one would so describe the scientist's belief that 'For whatever begins to be, there is a reason why it should so be and not otherwise.' If, on the other hand, Kierkegaard meant to require that the mind of the Christian cease to be rational, we are entitled to ask *why* (though the 'why' for ceasing to be rational seems a meaningless conception). It is not strange that no clear answer is given by the Kierkegaardians, but their evasion of the inquiry makes it all the more urgent that criticism should press it.

Most surprising to me is Dr. Oke's answer to my complaint that the theologian he so admires had turned the axioms of faith into behests of a non-rational and even anti-rational authority, instead of acknowledging and including them in his system of thought. My use of the word 'system' brings citation (from *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*) of Kierkegaard's argument that 'systematizing' is here impossible—at least for human minds, because they can make a system only of *ideas*, God alone being able to

make one of *existence*. This, I must protest, is totally irrelevant. When I urged 'system,' I meant only that Kierkegaard, in his actual practice of a philosophy he theoretically repudiates, should have included *all* the data of experience, rather than set up one group of them in unexplained isolation from—and even antagonism to—the rest. Such elementary demand for coherence (which must continue to be made, unless philosophy is to abandon its office) has nothing to do with the dispute between 'Idealism' and 'Existentialism.'

I found the value of Kierkegaard's work in his insistence (so timely when he wrote, and far from superfluous now) on an element of spiritual intuition, aptly compared to the ground on which one stands and for that very reason does not see. A further purpose of my article was to account for the long disregard of his fertile ideas, by the extravagance and exaggeration which marked his manner of presenting them, for example, in his *Attack on Christendom*. Like the critic of Henry Drummond's *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* who signed himself 'A Friend of the Natural Man,' I wrote as a friend of the intellectual man, to plead for that victim of present ill usage by the Kierkegaardians. One who welcomes most cordially the revival of interest in writings which so well reward study may at the same time insist that a century of neglect has not been remedied by a decade of undiscriminating panegyric.

H. L. Stewart

Halifax, Nova Scotia

1 John i. 1–3

The argument of G. M. Lee in the January issue of The Exository Times that the 'we' here implies that the writer was an eye-witness of the life of Christ overlooks the free way in which this writer uses the first and second person plural. It is often difficult to say exactly what he means by 'we.' When he says 'we say—we lie—we do' ($1^{6ff.}$) he obviously associates his readers with himself and those for whom he himself speaks. Does he mean this when he speaks of 'the message which we heard from him' (1^{5})? If ἀκηκόαμεν in 1^{1} means 'we, the apostles and eye-witnesses,' it should mean the same in 1^{5}. But the contents of the 'message' ('that God is light and there is no darkness at all in him') is not a quotation from the actual teaching of Jesus but seems rather to be a summary of the Christian message about the nature of God, in view of the ethical tendencies of the times. This supports the suggestion that the λόγος τῆς ζωῆς in 1^{2} does not refer to the Logos of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel but means the Christian message of life.

It is probable therefore that the contrast in 1^{1} is between the Christian preachers and teachers ('we') and the Christian congregation ('you') to which the book is addressed. This is paralleled in the Fourth Gospel, where the writer suddenly begins to speak on behalf of the Christian preachers —'we speak what we know and bear witness of what we heard, and you do not receive our witness' (Jn 3^{11}. Cf. Jn 1^{16}—'from his fulness we all received').

Two of the verbs which are held to denote an eye-witness in 1 Jn 1^{1-3} are indeeed used in 4^{14} in a context which seems to refer to the Christian experience of both writer and readers. After saying 'we know—we remain in him—we received his Spirit' he continues 'we have beheld and have borne witness that the Father sent the Son.' Such hearing and seeing and witnessing are the privilege of all Christians, even two generations after the time of Jesus. The writer's thought is well expressed in Charles Wesley's lines :

> What we have felt and seen
> With confidence we tell,

which may surely be sung by others than eye-witnesses of Jesus' work.

H. A. Guy

Southampton

Our Bread for the Morrow

The translation in the Lord's Prayer of ἐπιουσιον as 'food for the morrow,' which is favoured by some scholars, always seemed to me artificial till I overheard a remark in this district the other day. This showed that there might be considerable significance in such a translation.

Going by boat through the flooded rice fields, which are a feature of this part of the world, we saw a man with his fish traps and net. In the evening we met him returning home, and my boatman asked him how he had done. 'I have the food (*khorak*) for to-morrow.'

Of course. Of the fish that he catches to-day he will sell the greater part early to-morrow and with that buy the rice that he and his family need for their staple food. In the light of this consideration 'Give us to-day our bread for to-day' might suggest that we idly expect God just to produce the food for us without any effort on our part. But 'Give us to-day our bread for the morrow' reminds us that God gives us food indeed, but He gives it through our labour. We are co-operators with Him. We ask then through this phrase of the Prayer that He may so bless our daily work to-day that we may enjoy the fruits of it, whether to-morrow (as in the case of the fisherman) or whenever the harvest or fruit is due.

E. L. Wenger

Baptist Mission, Barisal, East Bengal

Recent Foreign Theology

The Heavenly Book. Professor G. Widengren, of Uppsala, whose wide range of scholarship is reflected in his numerous publications, has now published the third of the series of studies projected under the title of *King and Saviour*. The second of the series was published in 1946,[1] while the first is not yet published. The third is entitled *The Ascension of the Apostle and the Heavenly Book*.[2] The first chapter argues that at his enthronement the Babylonian and Assyrian king was held to be given the tablets of destiny by the god, and to be commissioned to regulate religion. He ascended to heaven to receive and then descended to execute his commission. The succeeding chapters argue that the same pattern is found more widely in the ancient East, modified, however, in the various places and ages. Professor Widengren discusses the Israelite and Jewish writings, and finds the same pattern in relation to Moses and the law-giving, in relation to the Israelite kings, and in relation to figures in the apocalyptic literature. The succeeding chapters pass in review the Samaritan and later Jewish literature, Mandaean literature, and Hermetic-Gnostic literature in Arabic. The versatility and learning of the author are reflected throughout, and this is an important study in the field of 'patternism' by one of its apostles. The author is not concerned to impose uniformity on his patterns, but to recognize the measure of variety that can be found within the pattern while yet it remains a pattern.

The Night Visions of Zechariah. Yet another Swedish Old Testament scholar has appeared in the person of L. G. Rignell, who has published an elaborate commentary in German on the eight Night Visions contained in Zec 1^{7}–6^{15}.[3] Much attention is paid to the versions, including the secondary Ethiopic and Arabic texts, and the author is familiar with a large number of commentaries, both ancient and modern. He offers a verse by verse commentary on a very full scale, and future students of these chapters of Zechariah will find a mine of information here, and will commend the author's command of the technique of patient exegesis. The Introduction is short, and in addition to reviewing the principal commentaries used gives an all too brief note on the historical setting of the work of Zechariah. Dr. Rignell finds that the language of Zechariah is 'manifestly' influenced by that of the Pentateuch, including that of some passages which are commonly assigned to P. The implied dating of P on such slender grounds as are here presented, and with so little examination of the issues involved, is to be deprecated. For instance, Zec $2^{14f.}$ (E.V. 10f.) is said to be so influenced by Ex $29^{45f.}$, and Zec 3^{9} by Ex 28^{36-38}. In neither case is any literary dependence provable—as perhaps the wary reader would suspect from the word 'manifestly.' This note of caution is not intended to detract from the praise for the general care which has gone into this study, or the learning on which it rests.

[1] Cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lix. [November, 1947], 52, where *Mesopotamian Elements in Manichæism* is noticed.

[2] Published as No. 7 of Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift for 1950. (Lundequistska, Uppsala; and Harrassowitz, Leipzig; Kr. 8.0. Like much of Widengren's work, this is written in English.

[3] *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja: eine exegetische Studie* [1950]. (Gleerup, Lund; Kr. 10.0).

A New Old Testament Journal. Last year at the International Old Testament Conference held at Leiden, there was formed an international organization of Old Testament scholars, which has now begun to issue a quarterly journal under the title *Vetus Testamentum*. With astonishing speed the first number appeared in January, under the editorship of Professor P. A. H. de Boer, of Leiden, and an international Editorial Board, on which the British member is Professor G. W. Anderson, of Handsworth. The first issue contains an important article by Professor Kahle, written in English, on the Age of the recently found Dead Sea Scrolls, and another by S. Talmon containing notes on the Habakkuk Commentary which was found amongst them. There is a long German article by Professor Alt on the Kingship in the States of Israel and Judah, an article by L. H. Brockington on δόξα in the Greek translation of Isaiah, and one by Professor de Boer on an Oxyrhynchus papyrus in Hebrew. In addition there are several short notes on various texts and some reviews. The new journal promises to be an important one in the field of Old Testament studies, and it should be placed in the libraries of all Theological Colleges. The subscription is £2 per annum, and the publisher is the well-known Dutch publisher of Oriental books, E. J. Brill, of Leiden.

Biblical Themes. Of the interest in Biblical Theology there is ever-growing evidence. A French writer has published a series of studies in this field, though his book does not pretend

to cover the field.[1] He selects certain subjects and traces them through the Bible in a simple way. There is nothing of the profundity of Wheeler Robinson's various studies, or of the thoroughness of A. R. Johnson's, but the author is writing for a different public. He might with advantage have used these and other works, including Snaith's *Distinctive Ideas*. The selected themes are: the Exodus and Wandering in the Desert; Grace, Justice and Truth; Sin; Damnation; Hope; and the Breath of the Lord. It would be easy to add to this list, though it is fair to say that a number of subjects are treated under some of these headings. The treatment of the Old Testament is fuller than that of the New. The whole should be widely useful as an introduction to Biblical Theology, and the author's clear recognition of a fundamental unity of the Bible is to be welcomed and is in harmony with present-day trends.

The Heart in the Old Testament. It is frequently stated that the heart is the seat of the intelligence in Biblical thought, as though this were its chief use. More guarded statements have been made by many writers, however, and a very slight study of the Bible should provide a corrective. A Dutch scholar has now carefully examined every passage in the Old Testament in which the word 'heart' occurs and has classified the uses in order to establish how varied they are.[2] The author's linguistic equipment is limited, but he is fortunate in the liberal supply of paper at his disposal. In this country he would have had to compress his work greatly, and it might have been a gain. Every text of the Old Testament is given in Hebrew and Dutch, with a brief comment, and then all are gone over again, but this time classified according to the usage. Little is gained by the first review, and there was no need to quote the Hebrew in every case. It would have sufficed to quote the Hebrew where points were being discussed. At the same time the study reaches sound and useful conclusions, and it may do something to check the facile generalization that is all too common. There is a short summary in English at the end.

Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume. The great Hungarian Islamist, Ignace Goldziher, was born in 1850 and died in 1921. Two volumes of studies in memory of him are being published in Budapest, of which the first has appeared[3] and the second is expected shortly. The first volume contains more than thirty articles by leading scholars from all over the world, dealing mainly with subjects in the field of Islamics, but containing some that are devoted to Biblical questions. Most of the articles are written in English, the others being in French (four articles), Hebrew (four articles), German (one article), or Latin (one article). The contributors include such well-known and distinguished Arabists as Professors A. Jeffery, S. M. Zwemer, E. E. Calverley, H. A. R. Gibb, P. Kahle, A. J. Arberry, K. V. Ketterstéen, J. Pedersen, L. Massignon, and J. Somogyi, whose names are a sufficient guarantee of the scholarship of the volume. Of Biblical articles it must suffice to mention those by E. F. F. Bishop on 'Εὐλογητός' dealing with the words for 'blessed' used of God in the Bible and the Koran; by I. Löw on Ps 91; by S. Löwinger on Nebuchadnezzar's dream; and by the reviewer on 'The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah.' One article is devoted to Ras Shamra linguistic problems; and several to questions in the field of post-Biblical Jewish studies. The editors are Professors S. Löwinger and J. Somogyi, whose skilful surmounting of all the difficulties involved in the production of a volume mostly in English should be rewarded by the circulation of the work in the English-speaking world amongst scholars who are interested in Islamic and Biblical studies.

Palestine Down to Christian Times. The third and final volume of Professor Milos Bič's work, of which the earlier volumes have been mentioned in these columns, has now appeared.[4] It is written in Czech, like its predecessors, but has a French résumé, on which this note is based. The volume treats of the language, writing materials, and surviving texts, and it contains a number of plates illustrating the development of the alphabet and giving samples of the relevant texts which have been found—including the well-known page of the lately-discovered Dead Sea Scroll containing Is 40. Chapters are devoted to the literary forms of the Old Testament, to the preservation of the text and the minute care of the Massoretes, and to the history of the versions and their use

[1] J. Guillet, *Thèmes Bibliques : Études sur l'expression et le développement de la révélation* [1951]. (Aubier, Paris; Fr. 495.)

[2] F. H. von Meyenfeldt, *Het Hart (Lēb, Lēbāb) in het Oude Testament* [1950]. (Brill, Leiden.)

[3] *Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume*, Part I. (Budapest VIII, József-körút 27; the name of the publisher is not given.)

[4] *Palestine od Pravěku ke Křesťanství*, vol. iii. [1950.] (Prague, Husova Ceskoslovenská Evangelická Faculta Bohoslovecká.)

for curing errors which had invaded the text before the work of the Massoretes. The bibliography again shows the wide acquaintance of the author with the literature of the subject, and few countries have so up-to-date a work on this scale as the Czech readers will now have.

H. H. ROWLEY

Manchester University

Entre Nous

No Faith of My Own

Because of the way in which its writer came into the Christian Faith, *No Faith of My Own*, by the Rev. J. V. Langmead Casserley, M.A., D.Litt., A.K.C. (Longmans; 9s. 6d., paper covers, 6s. 6d. net), was bound to be an interesting book. 'I have,' he writes, 'at least this in common with those for whom this book is written: I grew up in complete isolation from the Christian Faith, as a member of a family which had entirely abandoned both the practice and profession of religion.' His parents were members of 'The Rationalist Press Association,' and he was 'as jealously guarded against the love of God as against the sins of men.' But that very rationalism insisted on 'the importance and necessity of intellectual persistence, on the inherent sinfulness of mere apathy and indifference to the solemn questions which life puts before us.' So, driven by his own early creed to investigate all things with an open mind, Dr. Langmead Casserley investigated the Christian Faith and was captured by it.

A man who came into the Christian Faith in such a way will obviously be a man with an adventurous mind. The pages of this book are scattered with vivid, stimulating sentences. Before Christ came men were estranged from God. 'They forgot where they came from, where they were going and why they were here.' Into this estranged world came God and His coming was 'a thrilling adventure of which God is the hero, crossing infinite spiritual distances and overcoming seemingly insuperable metaphysical obstacles in order to re-establish contact with man, a spiritual romance in which God is the lover clamouring passionately at the gateways of the human heart.' But when Christ came there awaited Him the Cross. 'It was ominous and appropriate that there was "no room at the inn" at the time of His birth. There was never to be any room for Jesus on earth until men made room for Him on the Cross.' Dr. Langmead Casserley asks the pointed and poignant question, 'In a world in which men crucify the Son of God, what will they do to each other?' Of the Cross, he says, 'There the love of God, which will not let man go, confronts the stark hostility of the sin of man, which will not let God come.'

Dr. Langmead Casserley has a gift for illuminating old doctrines with one flashing sentence. Of the Descent into Hades, he says, 'The joyous reunion with God through fellowship with the God-Man is as much a possibility for the citizens of the world B.C. as for the citizens of the world A.D.' 'To pray is a great adventure, a launching out into the uncharted spiritual spaces which separate God and man.' 'People pray best together when they also pray alone.' 'The Kingdom of Heaven is not unlike the cinema which presents to its patrons an attractive but salacious film. "No person under sixteen will be admitted unless accompanied by an adult." So runs the legend over the door, the death knell of so many adolescent hopes. Even so there is no entry into the Kingdom except in the company of *the adult*, the Christ, the grown-up Brother of the little, spoiled children of God.' 'Man cannot live in heaven because he is a sinner and he cannot be abidingly happy outside heaven because he is a child of God.'

It will easily be seen that this is a rich and an adventurous book. But there is one extremely odd passage in it. Dr. Langmead Casserley speaks of the Apostles, saying that Jesus appointed them as the first leaders of the Church. He goes on from that to speak of the Bishops appointed in the Apostolic succession. Then he goes on to say, 'Most of those smaller Christian communities which have existed only since the Reformation have lost this living link with the Christianity of New Testament times . . . the founders of these bodies judged the situation of the ancient Church which Our Lord gave us to be so desperate that the only remedy was to institute new Churches—called after the name of Christ indeed and dedicated to His glory but certainly not founded or contemplated by Him in the days of His flesh—and to furnish them with new ministries differing both in origin and principle from that of the ancient Church.' It is indeed a bizarre notion that Jesus Christ contemplated and founded the Episcopal Churches but not, for instance, the Presbyterian Churches. It is a pity that a man who, like Dr. Langmead Casserley, has said so many wise things could say such a foolish thing.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.